



Proceedings of the 63rd ANNUAL CONVENTION

NCAA

LOS ANGELES, CALIF./JANUARY 6-8, 1969

Proceedings
of the
**63rd Annual
Convention**
of the
**National Collegiate
Athletic Association**

**Los Angeles Hilton Hotel
Los Angeles, California
January 6-8, 1969**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Register, 1969

Administrative Organization	5
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Press	7

II. Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Convention

Opening Business Session

1. Opening Remarks	17
2. Convention Committees	18
3. Explanation of Voting Procedures	18
4. President's Remarks	19
5. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer	24
6. Report of the Executive Committee	26
7. Report of the Council	29
8. Report of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions...	34

Faculty Representatives-Athletic Directors Round Table

Recruiting	36
Grants-In-Aid	41
Spring Football Practice	43
General Trends	45

College Division Round Table

Basketball Tournament Format	54
Third Competitive Division	55
Freshman Rule	58
Regional Qualification Meets	67

Honors Luncheon

Introduction of Toastmaster	70
Recognition of Olympic Gold Medal Winners	71
Recognition of College Football Centennial Queen.....	72
Introduction of Postgraduate Scholarship Winners	73
Introduction of Honorees in Performing Arts Field	75
Presentation of Theodore Roosevelt Award	82

Continuance of Business Session

9. Report of the Television Committee	85
---	----

10. Proposed Amendments

Amateurism	86
Educational Objective of Intercollegiate Athletics..	86
Freshman Rule	87
Transfer Rule	94
NCAA Athletic Events	97
Extra Events	98
Playing and Practice Seasons	98

11. Review of Interpretations

Institutional Aid	99
Awards	107
Financial Aid	110
Eligibility for NCAA Events	112
1.600 Rule	114
Recruiting—Use of Funds	119
Recruiting—Tryouts	119
Recruiting—Visitations	121
Recruiting—Entertainment	121
Limitation on Playing Seasons	121

12. Other Proposals

Revisions in Executive Regulations	121
Revisions in Recommended Policies and Practices.....	122
Revision in Enforcement Procedure	122
Wrestling Federation Resolution	122
Transfer of Membership	123

13. Report of the Committee on Committees

14. Report of the Nominating Committee

III. Appendices

A. Report of the Treasurer	A-1
B. Proposed Amendments	B-1
C. Review of Interpretations	C-1
D. Revisions in Executive Regulations	D-1
E. Revisions in Recommended Policies and Practices	E-1
F. Revision in Enforcement Procedure	F-1
G. 1969 Convention Committees	G-1
H. NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1969	H-1
I. Past and Present Officers of NCAA	I-1



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Midland Building

Kansas City, Missouri 64105

August 4, 1969

816/221-7127

1969 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

President

HARRY M. CROSS, University of Washington
Professor of Law

Secretary-Treasurer

WILLIAM J. FLYNN, Boston College
Director of Athletics

Executive Director

WALTER BYERS, Midland Building, Kansas City, Missouri

The Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA President and Secretary-Treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chairman and secretary, respectively. Nine members of the Council are the eight District Vice-Presidents and the Vice-President-at-Large each of whom is elected for two years and may be immediately reelected for one additional term. Seven members are elected at-large for terms of three years and may not be reelected until three years have elapsed.

Vice-Presidents

District 1—Adolph W. Samborski, Harvard University
Director of Athletics

District 2—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University
Head, Department of Physical Education for Men

District 3—H. Boyd McWhorter, University of Georgia
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

District 4—James R. McCoy, Ohio State University
Dean, College of Administrative Science

District 5—David Swank, University of Oklahoma
Associate Professor of Law and Legal Counsel

District 6—J. William Davis, Texas Technological College
Professor of Government

District 7—Milton F. Hartvigsen, Brigham Young University
Dean, College of Physical Education

District 8—Raymond T. Ellickson, University of Oregon
Professor of Physics

At-Large—Wilford H. Ketz, Union College (N.Y.)
Chairman, Department of Physical Education and Athletics

1969 NCAA ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Council (Continued)

Members-at-Large

Frank R. Carver, University of Pittsburgh
Secretary to Board of Trustees

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
Director of Athletics

Arthur W. Nebel, University of Missouri
Dean, School of Social and Community Services

Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Head of Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Dwight T. Reed, Lincoln University (Mo.)
Director of Athletics

Marshall S. Turner, Jr., Johns Hopkins University
Chairman, Department of Physical Education and Athletics

Executive Committee

The NCAA President, Vice-President-at-Large and Secretary-Treasurer shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The remaining seven members of the Committee are elected by the Council for a period of one year. At least one new member shall be elected each year.

Jesse T. Hill, University of Southern California
Director of Athletics

H. B. Lee, Kansas State University
Director of Athletics

Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
Dean and Director of Athletics

Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
Professor of Law

Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
Dean, Division of Extension and University Services

Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
Dean of Students

James H. Weaver, Atlantic Coast Conference
Commissioner

SIXTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

DELEGATES, VISITORS

Active Member Institutions

District One

Amherst College: E. E. Richardson
Assumption College: Andrew Laska
Bates College: Lloyd H. Lux
Boston College: William J. Flynn, David Carroll
Boston State College: James P. Sullivan
Boston University: Robert Peck
Brandeis University: Nick Rodis
Bridgeport, University of: Herb Glines
Brown University: John M. Heffernan, F. X. (Pete) McCarthy
Central Connecticut State College: Lowell D. Lukas
Clark University: Russ Granger
Colby College: John W. Winkin
Connecticut, University of: James B. Hickey, E. L. Bartholomew, Jr., Robert Ingalls
Dartmouth College: Seaver Peters, Michael L. Slive
Hartford, University of: A. Peter LoMaglio
Harvard University: Adolph Samborski, Eric Cutler
Holy Cross College: Vincent G. Dougherty
Lowell Technological Institute: W. W. Yarnall
Maine, University of: Harold S. Westerman, Frank W. Myers
Massachusetts, University of: Richard E. Bergquist
Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Ross H. Smith
New Hampshire, University of: Andrew Mooradian, Lionel J. Carbonneau
Northeastern University: Herbert W. Gallagher, Joseph P. Zabalski
Providence College: A. B. Begley
Rhode Island, University of: Maurice Zarchen
Rhode Island College: William M. Baird
Salem State College: Richard Schneider
Southern Connecticut State College: Jess L. Dow, Eugene Shelar
Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz
Tufts University: Harry Arlanson, Eugene S. Ashton
United States Coast Guard Academy: Carl Selin
Vermont, University of: J. Edward Donnelly
Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell
Westfield State College: Paul Bogan
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Robert W. Pritchard
Yale University: DeLaney Kiphuth

District Two

Adelphi University: James Bedell
Albright College: Eugene L. Shirk

Albany, State University of New York: John R. Tibbetts,
Alfred C. Werner
Brooklyn College: Joseph M. Smith
Bucknell University: Robert A. Latour
Buffalo State University College: Howard B. MacAdam,
Howard A. Meyers, Jr., Chet Palmer
Buffalo, State University of New York: Raforod Boddy
City College of New York: Robert M. Behrman, Harold Johnson
Clarion State College: Frank Lignelli
Colgate University: Harold W. Lahar
Columbia University: Kenneth G. Germann
Cornell University: Robert J. Kane
Cortland, State University College: Roger I. Robinson
C. W. Post College: James Davey, Vincent Pedulla
Delaware, University of: David M. Nelson, Scotty Duncan
Delaware State College: James H. Williams
Delaware Valley College: Ned A. Linta
Drexel Institute of Technology: John Semanik
East Stroudsburg State College: John R. Eiler
Fairleigh Dickinson University (Madison): Robert T. Shields,
Harvey D. Woods
Fordham University: Peter A. Carlesimo
Franklin and Marshall College: W. Roy Phillips
Gannon College: Bud Elwell
Geneseo, State University College: Bob Riedel
Gettysburg College, Henry T. Bream
Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia
Hamilton College: Mox A. Weber
Hampton Institute: H. N. Neilson
Haverford College: Roy E. Randall
Hofstra University: Howard Myers, Jr., Bob Stewart
Howard University: Samuel E. Barnes
Hunter College: Elliot C. Derfler
Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Chuck Klausing
Ithaca College: Carlton Wood
Lafayette College: Olav Kollevoll
Lehigh University: William B. Leckonby
LeMoyne College: Thomas J. Niland, Jr.
Long Island University: William Lai
Lycoming College: Dave Busey
Manhattan College: Ken Norton
Morgan State College: Edward P. Hurt, Robert A. Smith
Montclair State College: Bill Dioguardi
Muhlenberg College: Ray Whispell
New York University: Ben L. Carnevale
Pace College: Peter Finnerty
PMC Colleges: George A. Hansell
Pennsylvania, University of: Fred Shabel
Pennsylvania State University: R. H. Wherry, Ernest B. McCoy,
Edward M. Czekaj, Ed Mattil, James I. Tarman
Pittsburgh, University of: Frank Carver, Casimir Myslinski
Queens College: Robert J. Tierney
Rider College: Tom Petroff

Rutgers University: Al Twitchell, Frederick E. Gruninger,
Leslie Unger
St. John's University: Walter T. McLaughlin
Scranton, University of: Dave Ocorr
Seton Hall University: John J. Horgan
Slippery Rock State College: Brad Keith, William C. Meise
Syracuse University: James H. Decker, Ferdinand A. Geiger
Temple University: Ernest C. Casale
Union College: Wilford H. Ketz, George W. Flood
U. S. Merchant Marine Academy: James W. Liebertz
U. S. Military Academy: Col. A. J. Dielens, Jr., Col. Jerry G. Capka
U. S. Naval Academy: Capt. J. O. Coppedge
Utica College: Eric Huggins
Wagner College: Herbert E. Sutter
West Chester State College: Bob Reese

District Three

Alabama, University of: Willard F. Gray, Jefferson J. Coleman,
C. G. Laslir
Alcorn A&M College: Marino H. Casem
American University: Anthony C. Morella, Robert H. Frailey
Auburn University: Charles F. Simmons
Austin Peay State University: Leon Bibb
Baltimore, University of: Arthur R. Bosley
Belmont Abbey College: Ted Crunkleton
Benedict College: Thomas S. Martin
Catholic University: E. R. LaFond
Chattanooga, University of: Tom Geraghty
Citadel, The: D. S. McAlister, Eddie Teague
Clemson University: R. R. Ritchie
Davidson College: Frontis W. Johnston, Tom Scott
East Carolina University: John O. Reynolds, Clarence Stasavich
East Tennessee State University: John Robert Bell
Eastern Kentucky University: Glenn E. Presnell
Emory University: Clyde Partin
Fisk University: H. B. Thompson
Florida, University of: James G. Richardson, Percy Beard
Florida State University: Robert C. Earnest, Vaughn Mancha
Gallaudet College: Peter R. Wisher
George Washington University: Robert Faris
Georgia, University of: Joel Eaves, H. Boyd McWhorter
Georgia Institute of Technology: J. W. Mason, John McKenna
Grambling College: C. D. Henry
Johns Hopkins University: Marshall S. Turner
Kentucky, University of: H. C. Lancaster
Kentucky State College: William Exum
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute: Harold J. Smolinski
Louisiana State University: Jack Gilmore
Maryland, University of: Jack Faber, William W. Cobey
Maryville College: H. J. Tomlinson, Alan T. Marshall
Memphis State University: R. M. Robison, Ruffner P. Murray
Miami, University of: Charles M. Capps
Middle Tennessee State University: E. K. Patty
Mississippi State University: Charles N. Shira

Morehouse College: F. L. Forbes
 Nicholls State College: Raymond Didier
 Norfolk State College: William H. Wright
 North Carolina, University of: Walter Rabb, Gerald A. Barrett
 North Carolina A&T State University: Artis P. Graves
 North Carolina College: James A. Stevens
 North Carolina State University: Roy B. Clogston
 Old Dominion University: A. B. Metheny
 Richmond, University of: Ralph C. McDanel, Frank Jones
 Saint Paul's College: J. E. Thompson
 South, University of: Walter Bryant
 South Carolina, University of: John C. Guilds, Paul F. Dietzel
 South Florida, University of: E. E. Stanton, Richard T. Bowers
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Reed Green
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: A. G. Urban
 Southwestern at Memphis: William R. Maybry
 Tennessee, University of: Earl M. Ramer, G. R. Woodruff
 Tennessee A&I State University: Howard C. Gentry
 Tennessee Technological University: R. Hooper Eblen
 Towson State College: Earl Killian
 Tulane University: Hugh F. Rankin, Harvey M. Jessup, Buddy De Monsabert, Bill Curl
 Tuskegee Institute: H. Frank Leftwich, Jr.
 Vanderbilt University: Jess C. Neely
 Virginia, University of: D. Alan Williams, Steve Sebo
 Virginia Military Institute: John G. Barrett
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: Wilson B. Bell, W. B. Matthews, Jerry D. Claiborne
 Virginia State College: William B. Bradley
 Wake Forest University: J. W. Sawyer, Gene Hooks, Jesse T. Haddock
 West Virginia, University of: Ruel E. Foster, Robert Brown
 William & Mary, College of: H. Lester Hooker, Jr.

District Four

Akron, University of: Kenneth Cochrane
 Ashland College: Fred Martinelli, George H. Donges
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Lee Tressel
 Ball State University: Bob Primmer
 Beloit College: Clarence Von Eschen
 Bowling Green State University: K. H. McFall
 Butler University: James Hauss
 Capital University: William Bernlohr
 Central Michigan University: Roy Kramer
 Chicago, University of: Walter L. Hass
 Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey
 Dayton, University of: Thomas J. Frericks, H. C. Baujan
 Denison University: Roy Seils, Francis C. Bayley
 DePauw University: James C. Loveless
 Detroit, University of: Cletus F. Hartmann, Richard J. Perry
 Eastern Illinois University: Tom Katsimpalis
 Eastern Michigan University: F. L. Ferzacca
 Illinois, University of (Champaign): H. Sheldon Stillwell, Gene Vance

Illinois, University of (Chicago): Richard C. Kohler, Walter G. Versen, George Strnad
 Illinois State University: Milton Weisbecker
 Iowa, University of: Robert F. Ray, Forest Evashevski
 Indiana State University: Woody Suttle, Gordon Chalmers
 Indiana University: Ed Cady, Bill Orwig
 John Carroll University: Georga A. Kmiecik
 Kent State University: Carl E. Erickson, Walton D. Clarke
 Kenyon College: Philip J. Morse
 Knox College: Dean S. Trevor, Albert Teilly
 MacMurray College: William L. Wall
 Mankato State College: Dick Koppenhaver
 Marquette University: Stanley Lowe
 Marshall University: Harold L. Willey, Edgar O. Barrett
 Miami University: Fred Cottrell, Dick Shrider
 Michigan, University of: Don Canham, Marcus L. Plant
 Michigan State University: John Fuzak
 Minnesota, University of: Max O. Schultze, Marsh Ryman
 Muskingum College: Ed Sherman
 Northern Illinois University: John B. Gardner, Robert J. Brigham, Howard Fletcher, Nye Labaw
 Northern Michigan University: Henry Heimonen, Rico Zenti
 Northwestern University: T. Leroy Martin, W. H. H. Dye, Waldo A. Fisher
 Notre Dame University: Ed Krause, Edmund Joyce, Jack Stephens
 Oberlin College: Lysle K. Butler
 Ohio State University: James R. McCoy, J. Edward Weaver, Richard C. Larkins, Wilbur E. Snypp
 Ohio University: Fred Picard, Bill Rohr
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Robert Strimer
 Otterbein College: Robert Agler
 Purdue University: V. C. Freeman, Roy L. Whistler, Bill Newell
 St. Joseph's College: Andrew G. Mehall, Richard F. Scharf
 St. Olaf College: Axel C. Bundgaard
 Southern Illinois University: Donald N. Boydston, Bill Brown
 Toledo, University of: A. G. Francis, Frank X. Lauterbur
 Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig
 Wayne State University: Vernon K. Gale
 Western Illinois University: Harry Fritz
 Western Michigan University: Leo C. Vander Beek, Joseph T. Hoy
 Wheaton College: Donald C. Boardman, Harvey C. Chrouser
 Wittenberg University: William M. Edwards
 Wisconsin, University of (Madison): Ivan B. Williamson, William H. Aspinwall
 Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee): Herman Kluge, David W. Robinson
 Wooster, College of: Robert M. Bruce
 Xavier University: Ed Biles, Jack Cherry

District Five

Augustana College: Jim Malmquist
 Bradley University: Orville Nothdurft, A. H. Haussler, Charles K. Orsborn

Central Missouri State College: Floyd A. Walker
 Cincinnati, University of: George Smith, Ralph C. Bursiek
 Coe College: Glenn J. Drahn
 Colorado, University of: W. H. Baughn, Fred Casotti
 Drake University: Leland P. Johnson, Robert D. Karnes
 Iowa State University: Maurice W. Soult, C. R. Bickerstaff, Harry G. Burrell
 Kansas, University of: Laurence C. Woodruff, Wade Stinson
 Kansas State Teachers College: Joseph M. Pease
 Kansas State University: H. B. Lee
 Lincoln University: Dwight T. Reed
 Loras College: John E. Coe
 Louisville, University of: Carl E. Abner, Bernard Hickman
 Missouri, University of: Arthur W. Nebel
 Morningside College: R. D. Halford
 Nebraska, University of: Merk Hobson, Don Bryant
 North Dakota, University of: L. R. Marti
 North Dakota State University: Ron Erhardt
 Northern Iowa, University of: James H. Witham
 North Texas State University: William A. Miller, Jess Cearley
 Northeast Missouri State: John Black, James J. Dougherty
 Oklahoma, University of: David Swank, Gomer T. Jones
 Oklahoma State University: Randall J. Jones, Donald L. Cooper
 St. Louis University: Jerome J. Marcherri, W. J. Duford
 South Dakota, University of: John O. Roning
 South Dakota State University: Stan Marshall
 Southeast Missouri State College: Kenneth Knox
 Southwest Missouri State College: Aldo Sebben
 Tulsa, University of: John P. Dratz, Glenn Dobbs
 Wichita State University: Bert Katzenmeyer, Robert M. Holmer
 William Jewell College: Norris A. Patterson

District Six

Abilene Christian College: Garvin Beauchamp
 Arkansas, University of: John Kane, J. H. Barnhill, George R. Cole, Bob Cheyne
 Arkansas AM&N College: Vannette W. Johnson
 Arkansas State University: J. A. Tomlinson, Don Floyd
 Baylor University: Ed P. Horner, R. E. Henderson
 Centenary College: Orvis Sigler, Jack S. Wilkes
 Houston, University of: A. A. White, Harry Fouke
 Lamar State College of Technology: James B. Higgins
 New Mexico State University: Carl R. Hall
 Pan American College: John W. Hook, James A. Brooks
 Rice University: Alan J. Chapman
 Southern Methodist University: Harold Jeskey
 Texas, University of (Arlington): Claude Gilstrap
 Texas, University of (Austin): J. Neils Thompson, Orville Wyss
 Texas A & M University: O. D. Butler
 Texas Christian University: Ken Herrick, Abe Martin
 Texas Technological College: J. William Davis, Polk Robison
 Trinity University: Jess G. Carnes
 West Texas State University: W. Mitchell Jones, Frank Kimbrough
 Wiley College: J. Forrest Kelley

District Seven

Arizona, University of: M. R. Clausen, Louis A. Myers, Frank W. Soltys
 Arizona State University: Clyde B. Smith, Alfred Thomas, Jr.
 Brigham Young University: Floyd Millet, Milton V. Hartvigsen
 Colorado School of Mines: Francis E. Smiley, Fritz Brennecke, Truman H. Kuhn
 Colorado State College: A. R. Reynolds, Joe Lindahl
 Colorado State University: Harry E. Troxell, Perry Moore, Thurman F. McGraw
 Denver, University of: N. H. Evers, Hoyt Brawner
 Idaho, University of: John C. Thomas, Paul E. Ostyn
 Idaho State University: James G. Backes, Milton Holt
 Montana, University of: Earl C. Lory, Walter C. Schwank
 Montana State University: Harry G. Cockrum, Gene Bourdet
 New Mexico, University of: Guido Daub, Pete McDavid
 Southern Colorado State College: Houston C. Bimms
 Texas, University of: Richard W. Burns, Jim Bowden, George C. McCarty
 United States Air Force Academy: Philip J. Erdle, Col. Frank Merritt
 Utah, University of: James R. Jack
 Utah State University: Frank Williams
 Weber State College: Dale L. Gardner, Milton C. Mecham
 Western State College of Colorado: H. J. Dorricott
 Wyoming, University of: Glenn J. Jacoby, Dick Brown

District Eight

Alaska, University of: John C. Gilmore
 California, University of (Berkeley): Robley C. Williams, Paul Brechler
 California, University of (Davis): William Lakie, Robert S. Loomis
 California, University of (Irvine): Raymond H. Thornton
 California, University of (Los Angeles): Thomas L. Jacobs, J. D. Morgan, Robert Bell, Bob Fischer
 California, University of (Riverside): Franklin A. Lindeburg, Frank T. Bingham
 California, University of (Santa Barbara): Andy S. Everest, Stephen Goodspeed
 California Institute of Technology: Warren Emery
 California State College (Fullerton) John Caine
 California State College (Hayward): Lew Comer, George H. Peterson, W. R. Morford
 California State College (Long Beach): Fred Miller, Bob Wuesthoff
 California State College (Los Angeles): Cameron S. Deeds, Ried Gunnell, Jesse B. Allen
 California State Polytechnic College (Pomona): V. L. Gregory, Richard M. Swenson, Frank Lansford
 California State Polytechnic College (San Luis Obispo): John R. Jones, R. R. Harper
 Chapman College: P. R. Theibert
 Chico State College: Rex R. Grossart
 Claremont-Harvey Mudd Colleges: Bill Arce

Fresno State College: Cecil Coleman, George Ilg
Hawaii, University of: Paul Durham
Humboldt State College: Larry W. Kerker
Nevada, University of: Glenn J. Lawlor
Nevada Southern University: Michael Drakulich
Occidental College: Roy Dennis
Oregon, University of: Ray Ellickson, Leonard J. Casanova
Oregon State University: Kline R. Swygard, James G. Barratt
Pacific, University of: Cedric W. Dempsey, George Thomas
Pepperdine College: H. G. Derrick, Walter Glass
Pomona College: Edward W. Malan
Portland, University of: Al Negratti
Portland State College: J. Neil Stahley
Puget Sound, University of: Bob Ryan
Redlands, University of: Ted Runner, Frank R. Serrao, Reinhold J. Krantz
Sacramento State College: Fred Lewis
San Diego State College: Al Olsen, Maurice Crawford, Dick Wells
San Fernando Valley State College: Glenn W. Arnett, Sam Winningham, Phil Munroe
San Francisco, University of: Peter P. Phelps
San Jose State College: Robert Bronzan
Sonoma State College: Lloyd H. Helgeson
Southern California, University of: William C. Himstreet, Forrest F. Twogood, Jesse T. Hill
Stanford University: Charles A. Taylor
Washington, University of: Harry M. Cross, James D. Owens
Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Stan Bates

Allied Members

Atlantic Coast Conference: James H. Weaver, Gene Corrigan
Big Eight Conference: Wayne Duke, John Waldorf
Big Sky Athletic Conference: John B. Friel
Big Ten Conference: John D. Dewey, William R. Reed
Central Collegiate Conference: Stanley Lowe
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: William T. Johns
College Athletic Conference: William R. Maybry
Eastern College Athletic Conference: Asa S. Bushnell, George L. Shiebler
Far Western Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: R. S. Loomis
Gulf States Conference: Stanley Galloway
Indiana Collegiate Conference: Andrew G. Mehall
Interstate Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Dempsey E. Reid
Ivy Basketball League: Gib Holgate
Maine Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Stuart P. Haskell
Mid-American Conference: Robert C. James
Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Marshall S. Turner
Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference: Clarence Von Eschen
Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Roy F. Brown
Missouri Valley Conference: Norvall Neve
New England College Athletic Conference: Herbert W. Gallagher
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Jack McClelland

Ohio Athletic Conference: A. N. Smith
Ohio Valley Conference: Arthur L. Guepe
Pacific-8 Conference: Thomas J. Hamilton
Southeastern Conference: A. M. Coleman, Cliff Harper
Southern Conference: Lloyd P. Jordan
Southland Conference: Taylor Wilkins
Southwest Athletic Conference: Howard Grubbs, Wilbur Evans, Cliff Speegle
Southwestern Athletic Conference: C. D. Henry
Western Athletic Conference: Wiles Hallock
Yankee Conference: J. O. Christian

Associated Members

Baptist College: Paul G. Reitzer
Boise State College: Lyle Smith
Husson College: Dale Merrill, Keith Mahaney
South Alabama, University of: Mel Lucas

Affiliated Members

College Swimming Coaches Association of America: Richard A. Anderson
National Athletic Trainers Association: Jack Rockwell
National Collegiate Athletic Association Golf Coaches Association: Vic Kelley

Visitors

American Dental Association: Dr. William D. Heintz
Athletic Journal: Charlie Thorp
California Junior College Association: Fred Baer, Kenneth E. Ainge
Cutting and Associates: Malcolm M. Cutting, Pete Dawson
Football Publications: Lois Friddell
Gator Bowl Association, Inc.: George R. Olsen, Henry Dartigalongue, Ted Emery
Guilford College: Herb Appenzeller
Liberty Bowl: A. F. Dudley
Memphis Memorial Stadium: T. J. Foley, Jr.
NCAA Films: Dick Snider, Jim Vickers
National Association of College Directors of Athletics: Mike Cleary
National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Chester J. LaRoche, Harvey Harman
Northern Arizona University: Ted Keck
Orange Bowl: James L. Llewellyn, John R. Ring
Pasadena Bowl: Gary Dorn, John Nicoll
Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Ray Dorn, Stan Hahn, Lathrop Leishman, William Nicholas, Gleeson Payne
Pepsi Cola Company: Frank Petinos
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: H. B. Kniseley
St. Cloud State College: Edward Colletti, Bob Peterson
Spencer Advertising Company: George Faherty
Sugar Bowl: Paul De Blanc, Cliff Kern, Theo. Moumas, Claude Simons, Charles C. Zatarain
Marvin H. Sugarman, Inc.: Marvin Sugarman
Sun Bowl: Harrison D. Kohl
Tel Ra Productions: W. Wallace Orr, Jr., Bosh Pritchard

TVS Television Network: Eddie Einhorn
U. S. Army: Tom McCann
U. S. Gymnastics Federation: Frank Bare
U. S. Government: John P. Wilbern
U. S. Track and Field Federation: Wayne Cooley

Working Press

Arizona Star: Abe Chanin
Associated Press: Will Grimsley, Bob Meyers, Jack Stevenson
Chicago Tribune: David Condon
Christian Science Monitor: Cliff Gewecke
Cleveland Plain Dealer: Ed Chay
Detroit News: Larry Middlemas
Knoxville News Sentinel: Tom Siler
Long Beach Press Telegram: Loel Schrader
Los Angeles Times: Dwight Chapin
Minneapolis Tribune: Sid Hartman
Nashville Banner: Fred Russell
New York Times: Gordon White
Pasadena Star News: Joe Hendrickson
Sports Illustrated: Jack Hahn
United Press International: Al Kahn, Jim Cour
Station KMPC: Fred Hessler
Station KNX: Jim Raser
Station KTTV: Bill Welsh

OPENING BUSINESS SESSION

Monday, January 6, 1969

The opening session convened in the Pacific Ballroom at ten-ten o'clock, the President of the Association, Marcus L. Plant of the University of Michigan, presiding.

1. OPENING REMARKS

President Plant: Gentlemen, it is my pleasure, privilege and honor to welcome you to the Convention and to the sunny climate of California. I hope that all of you recall last year we had one delegate who said he thought carrying on a convention with the icy wind blasting through the walls of the Biltmore Hotel and all of us wearing overcoats and carrying handwarmers and blankets was a more stimulating way of carrying out a convention than this; it bespoke character. One other man complained the weather was too warm. But I do think that the Subcommittee on Weather or the Committee on Arrangements deserves a hand.

Let me say that I have found my greatest satisfaction during the past year in my contacts with the members of the Association and their willingness to help on any occasion. Of the requests that I have made for assistance and advice, I have had no turndowns and have had nothing but cheerful responses.

For this I am very grateful personally, and I think the Association may take great pride in that fact, because not only do we have cheerful cooperation and willingness to work, but we have a membership that has the capacity to do what it is asked to do. This is probably the secret of our success and will be the secret of our success in the future.

The men who do the greatest amount of work and who carry the heaviest load, of course, are the members of the Council and the Executive Committee. (President Plant then introduced the members of the Council and Executive Committee.)

I should also regretfully make observance of the fact that one of the members of the Council, Bradford A. Booth, head of the English Department at the University of California, Los Angeles, died in December of last year. Brad was one of the most dedicated and hard-working, conscientious members of any Council. He made a tremendous contribution, and all of you remember him, I am sure, for his participation in the Convention. It is a sad duty to report that his name will be on the list that will be presented later by the Committee on Memorial Resolutions.

I should also like to present another distinguished gentleman who renders a considerable amount of aid to our Association. He is Harry M. Cross, professor of law at the University of Washington. He is chairman of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, a member of the Infractions Committee and we have asked him again to serve as parliamentarian.

2. CONVENTION COMMITTEES

There have been no changes in the Nominating Committee and the Committee on Committees. (These committees are listed on page G-1.)

The Committee on voting has undergone several changes. Rix Yard is unable to be here, and in his place we have called upon Bill Maybry, Southwestern at Memphis. He has been chairman of this committee for three years, and now it is a surprise and delight I am sure to find himself chairman once again.

Ken Fairman, of Princeton, is unable to be here, and in his place, Al Twitchell of Rutgers will serve.

The Committee on Credentials (see page G-2) checks your credentials. It is not the committee that issues credentials to you, such as credit cards to wander about the city. If you are suspicious of your neighbor, that he is here under false pretenses or that he is incompetent to understand the issues and vote upon them properly, report it to the Committee on Credentials and Bob Bronzan will take care of it. I have checked the records and the Committee on Credentials has never functioned in the history of the Association other than to hold office.

Father Begley is chairman of the Committee on Memorial Resolutions. A little later this morning he will present the list of the names of persons who have died since our last meeting. If the list is incomplete, mention it to Father Begley or to one of the other members of the Committee so that the person's name may appear in the Proceedings of the Convention and so that an appropriate communication may go forward to his family.

3. EXPLANATION OF VOTING PROCEDURES

There has been a good deal of thought given to the voting procedure during the past year, stemming largely I think from one of the actions at the Convention in New York in which an important measure was passed by a very narrow margin which raised questions in the minds of some as to the accuracy under those circumstances of our method of voting.

Each active member and each allied member of the Association is entitled to one vote. Some representatives will represent an active member and also an allied member, such as the member of the university who represents the conference to which the university belongs.

Members are entitled to have more than one representative, but the voting delegate has a white badge and the alternate delegate has a blue badge. If the voting delegate is present he is the one who is to cast the vote. In his absence the alternate is entitled to vote.

Visitors have pink badges and members of the press will have goldenrod badges. The badge is necessary to attend the business session.

A Constitutional amendment requires a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, and this requirement also applies to official interpretations of the Constitution. Bylaws amendments require a simple majority of those present and voting, as do official interpretations of the Bylaws.

On relatively routine, noncontroversial matters we will proceed as we always have with a voice vote. If there is doubt as to the outcome of the voice vote we will have a standing vote. If the standing vote raises a question or a question is raised as to it, we will have a ballot vote. At that point, the Chair will indicate which ballot is to be used. On the first ballot vote the ballot to be used will not necessarily be Ballot No. 1.

The green portion of the ballot will be used for an affirmative vote; the red portion will be used for a negative vote. All of our tellers have been checked to see whether they are colorblind.

On the ballot vote, the authorized representative will cast the ballot, and for this purpose the ballots have been issued to the voting delegate as indicated by the University. In the event that the voting delegate is not present for a particular vote the ballot may be cast by an alternate delegate.

If the voting delegate leaves the room or is unable to attend the session he should give his ballots to his alternate.

It is important not to misplace or lose the numbered ballots as we do not plan to issue any replacements.

If a roll call vote is requested, it must be approved by a majority of those at the Convention.

I think now I will call upon the Parliamentarian to explain the procedure by which we may initiate and effectuate amendments to the amendments that have been circularized.

Harry M. Cross (University of Washington and Parliamentarian): As President Plant has indicated, there are provisions in both the Constitution and Bylaws for amendments.

All proposed amendments have been circularized to the membership and are printed in the Convention Program. If these proposals when presented by motion on the floor are subjected to a proposed amendment, an amendment in the Official Notice and in the Convention Bulletin becomes the motion before the house, upon motion by the maker, and that motion, of course, is subject to amendment by the voting process of the assembly and is the amendment to the amendment, the basic amendment being that in the Convention Program. An amendment to an amendment must be submitted to the Secretary before one o'clock of the second day of the Convention.

An amendment proposed at the Convention cannot change the published amendment so that the end result is a more extensive variation from the present rule.

There is one difference between an amendment proposed at the Convention and an amendment carried in the Program. An amendment proposed here, either to a Constitutional amendment or Bylaw amendment, can be adopted by a simple majority vote, but a proposed amendment to the Constitution, whether modified here by a majority vote or not, must be passed by two-thirds vote of the Convention, and the amendment to the Bylaws, whether amended here or not, can be passed by a majority vote of the Convention.

4. PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

President Plant: There is one phase of my stewardship for which I feel a responsibility to render a personal accounting.

It is a topic that has been discussed many times in the Conventions of recent years. I do feel that I ought to make a clear statement on the continuing of the dispute between the school-college community and others who support the Federation Movement on the one hand, and the Amateur Athletic Union on the other.

Last year at the round table, I reported on the activities of the Sports Arbitration Board, chaired by Theodore Kheel, and the hearings that were conducted by the U. S. Senate Committee on Commerce, chaired by the Honorable Warren Magnuson of the State of Washington.

At no time during the proceedings or hearings was I embarrassed to advocate our position. The NCAA's continued support of the various federations is admirable and the cause is just. All that we seek is the establishment of a fair and democratic process in the making of sports policies which affect our own programs, with the ultimate goal of advancing and improving amateur athletics in the United States.

The Sports Arbitration Board concluded its activities early in 1968. All parties involved in the track and field dispute were invited to send representatives to Washington on February 1. That meeting took the form of a press conference in the Capitol Building. Senator Magnuson presided at the press conference at which the Sports Arbitration Board's decision was presented. Mr. Kheel was there and three other members of the Board were there, and all made comments.

At that meeting Father Crowley, who was then president of the United States Track and Field Federation, and Walter Byers pointed out that there were certain egregious errors in the report we had received only a few hours before, and that there were certain serious ambiguities in the Board's report. In response we were told that both the U. S. Track and Field Federation and the NCAA would be permitted to file questions with Chairman Kheel and responses would be forthcoming as long as those questions did not attempt to change the Board's decision but only clarify it.

As part of the Board's decision, the president of each of the four organizations was asked to notify Senator Magnuson within ten days whether they would recommend to their governing body agreement to the Board's decision.

Both the NCAA and the U. S. Track and Field Federation were disappointed that most of the key issues involved in the dispute were not settled by the decision. They were referred to a "coordinating committee," which was to be presented in the future. We withheld judgment, however, as requested by Senator Magnuson, and went forward with a thorough study of the report in all good faith to see if it contained the basis for a reasonably fair settlement. Personally, I discussed the matter with all knowledgeable and interested parties I could reach and those who would listen to me and talk with me, including faculty representatives, those in my own conference and others, directors of athletics in my own conference and others and one university president.

Meanwhile, both the NCAA and the U. S. Track and Field Federation submitted questions to Mr. Kheel. His responses were disheartening. Up to that time there seemed to be a real possibility that if

the ambiguities were cleared up in a satisfactory fashion and some of the questions answered in a satisfactory fashion the Board's decision could become a viable means of settlement, but as I say, the responses were disheartening. After receiving them I continued to talk to people, however. I asked Senator Magnuson for some extra time, which he granted. At a meeting held in Detroit following the National Collegiate Indoor Track and Field Championships, which all coaches present at that meet were urged to attend, we had a three or four-hour discussion of the subject. Our Council was there; our Executive Director was there; and by that time we had the response of Chairman Kheel to our questions.

The coaches were representative of the country geographically. They were unanimous at the end of the discussion that the Board's decision could not be accepted, and after the questions had been answered by Mr. Kheel everyone I spoke to was unanimous in that decision.

On the appointed date, I notified Senator Magnuson that I could not recommend to the NCAA Council and Executive Committee that the SAB decision be accepted by this Association. The U. S. Track and Field Federation Executive Committee also rejected the decision.

I will not go into detail as to the reasons and analyze the problem. My letter to Senator Magnuson, you may recall, was printed in full in the April, 1968, issue of the NCAA NEWS. I can sum it up simply by saying that the decision simply did not provide for a basic solution to the track and field problem. It limited itself to a relatively narrow segment of the problem. It failed to say anything about a number of vital disputes which had been presented to the Board as concrete and difficult problems over the two years and they were pushed ahead to some future solution by the Coordinating Committee.

I think we had valid reasons for rejecting the decision and in May the Executive Committee and Council unanimously concurred in the action that had been taken. Only last week a colleague asked me whether I did not think that I had put the NCAA and myself in contempt of the U. S. Senate by rejecting the Board's proposals. I am convinced that the answer is clearly "No" whether you use the term technically or whether you use it in the popular sense. Technically, there was no legal obligation to accept the decision. There was no law that said we were bound by it. There was no authoritative order to accept the decision. We disobeyed no government authority in doing it.

As to the popular use of the word "contempt," my letter of rejection was carefully respectful, and I might read my closing statement:

"I realize, Senator Magnuson, that this reply will be disappointing to you and the other members of the Commerce Committee. It is my sincere hope that you will not conclude that our position has been reached capriciously or in any spirit of defiance. My associates and I do not consider ourselves 'warriors' in this matter, as we have been sometimes satirically designated. Nothing would please us more than to end the dispute, but I feel a basic responsibility to counsel the NCAA not to enter into another arrangement of expediency which at best can only

postpone temporarily the outbreak of future difficulties. No law or agreement can be effective if those who are to be governed by it are not convinced of its basic fairness.

"May I express to you on behalf of the NCAA our gratitude for your interest in this matter and my deep disappointment and regret that it has not in my judgment arrived at the point of solution."

Senator Magnuson was obviously angered by our rejection. He stated publicly that he would initiate action to have the Sports Arbitration Board's decision enacted into law without conducting further hearings on the subject. There have been only two instances in American history in which an Arbitration Board's decision has been enacted into law, once during a railroad strike in World War I and once during the steel strike, I think during President Truman's term of office, and each time they had a hearing. This threat was deeply disturbing to us, of course, and to all those who support the U. S. Track and Field Federation. Indeed, I made every effort to persuade everyone involved not to take such action. There are at least three people in this room whom I called at twelve o'clock for a meeting at seven o'clock, rounded them from their slumbers to sound the alarm, and they cooperated very effectively.

In June, the matter came before the Senate Commerce Committee again, and at that time we were gratified that the Commerce Committee did not pursue the plan to write the Board's decision into the statute books. Instead they unanimously recommended that a bill authored by Senator James Pearson of Kansas to establish a federally chartered U.S. Track and Field Association similar to the U.S. Track and Field Federation be reported out favorably by the Judiciary Committee.

Now in the NCAA, while we have taken the position we are generally opposed to legislation, our position has been if you have to have it, Senator Pearson's bill is the best that we have seen and we favor it above other proposals. But no action was taken by the Judiciary Committee, the Congress adjourned and nothing has happened in that area since then.

The significant fact though is the Commerce Committee itself by this action, as I interpret it, buried the Kheel report and of course the Arbitration Board decision and went on record supporting a single-purpose track and field organization.

There has been relative peace and tranquility since June. Each side, of course, was absorbed in the Olympic effort.

I want to conclude by outlining what may be some of the signals of hope on the horizon.

You may recall in 1967 one of the most bitter controversies that developed in this broadly spread warfare was in the field of gymnastics, when the AAU declared that certain American college athletes were ineligible because they participated in a meet between Pennsylvania State University and Cologne University which was held on the Penn State campus. The meet was confined entirely to college students. Ultimately the ineligibility ruling was withdrawn by AAU, with the exception of one athlete, who to the best of my knowledge is still held ineligible by the AAU.

The international governing body for gymnastics is the Interna-

tional Gymnastics Federation, known as FIG. The president of FIG, Arthur Gander, a wise gentleman, has been deeply concerned about the situation in the United States. During 1968, he has met with representatives of the U.S. Gymnastics Federation and the AAU. After thorough discussion, a draft was made of the proposal for a National Gymnastics Commission for the United States. Mr. Gander suggested that each organization take up this proposal with its appropriate governing group and that it be signed at the time of the Olympics in Mexico City. The U.S. Gymnastics Federation immediately indicated its acceptance. The AAU at first declined to accept it, and then made some counter proposals which were very elaborate and which had all sorts of what seemed to be internal equipment for complete failure, and it was in that status when Mr. Gander passed through the United States on his way to the Olympics in Mexico City. He conferred in New York with these gentlemen again, and in Mexico City he conferred with them, and in Mexico City there were 78 other representatives in the field of gymnastics present. Finally he called the two sides together and the two sides signed the Commission agreement subject, of course, to ratification by their governing bodies. The U.S. Gymnastics Federation Council immediately ratified it.

Initially, the AAU Executive Committee voted to reject the plan. Thereupon the AAU Gymnastics Committee voted that the AAU should become a party to the Commission agreement and requested that the proposal be brought to the AAU Convention floor for a vote. By a vote of 646 to 70, better than a 9 to 1 ratio, the delegates in attendance at the AAU's 1968 convention in Las Vegas voted to accept the National Gymnastics Commission, repudiated their Executive Committee and voted that the Commission plan be adopted and that they affiliate with it.

I think that is significant, because we have said from time to time that our battle was not with the men in the field who were doing the work, but with the rather limited group of hierarchy.

What did this Commission plan to do? Of course, the basic purpose was to promote and improve the sport of gymnastics through mutual cooperation. It involved equal representation—five members from the AAU, five members from the Federation. Each organization will name a nonvoting, rotating president, on an annual basis who will be the eleventh member of the Commission. The Commission will be responsible for all phases of gymnastics operation, i.e., selection of officials, managers, coaches and sites, as well as all other representatives for all international events. Both sides, the Federation and the AAU, are free to arrange and conduct their programs domestically within the limits of their ability without any interference from the other. If there is a dispute on an issue, it is to be referred to Mr. Gander and he will issue his opinion on it.

It is a simple idea. It should not be confused, however, with the Coordinating Committee that was proposed in track and field. This is a board or a body, a Commission which has complete range over the field, national as well as International, and while the AAU remains a member of the international body the Commission is the one who makes the decisions which the AAU is obligated to carry out. It covers international as well as national and also covers all phases of the dispute, not only jurisdiction but selection of coaches, sites,

schedules and whatever you have, whatever will be brought before this Commission.

Of course, the proof of the pudding will be in the eating. It has met, and it seems to be functioning well. The last time I talked to Frank Bare (USGF Director) he was optimistic and enthusiastic about it, and said that the spirit of cooperation did exist instead of the spirit of warfare.

I applaud the action of those delegates at the AAU Convention who voted for the National Gymnastics Commission. The thought that immediately occurs to you, of course, is: What is the matter with this general kind of system for all of the phases of our dispute, wrestling and track and field?

Thus, as my term of office comes to a close, I put this commission plan for peace before you for your serious consideration. It is my hope that you can soon see this plan or some variation thereof created in other sports so that we may rechannel our energies from disputation to cooperation and all of us then move forward and do what is right for all amateur athletics in America. [Applause]

The reports of the Vice-Presidents and of the Rules and Tournament Committees are available. All of you should have received copies. I commend them to your attention.

I now will turn to our Secretary-Treasurer, Ernie McCoy, and ask him for his report.

5. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

Ernest B. McCoy (Pennsylvania State University): Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is the responsibility of the Secretary-Treasurer to inform the membership at this meeting of the financial status of the Association and provide information as to the growth of its membership.

Francis A. Wright and Company of Kansas City, Missouri, has submitted the audit of the Association's financial status for the period September 1, 1967, through August 31, 1968. Included is the audit of the accounts of the National Collegiate Sports Services, prepared by Steinberg, Sands and Stone of New York City, and a report on the financial operations of the College Athletics Publishing Service by Walter L. Mittelstaedt, Phoenix, Arizona.

(The detailed financial reports may be found on pages A-1 through A-12.)

You will find there was a nominal increase in current assets during the past fiscal year. The Association's current assets now total \$578,212.73. There was also a nominal increase in total reserves, which amount to \$1,051,684.12 as compared to \$1,040,375.37 as of August 31, 1967.

General income for the fiscal year was \$564,259.84, an increase of approximately \$25,000 over the previous year. The highly successful National Collegiate Basketball Championship is primarily responsible for the Association's growth in income. During the 1968 tournament every ticket was sold for all games; first round, regionals and finals. The College Division Basketball Tournament also experienced a record year financially.

The general operating expense of the Association also increased by approximately \$25,000 to a total of \$410,794.34.

The most significant increase was in the area of printing due to the decision to publish the NCAA NEWS on a monthly basis and to expand its format. Most of the members of my staff at Penn State eagerly look forward to receiving the NEWS each month and I believe this attitude is shared by all of us in the Association. I believe it is the most informative periodical dealing with intercollegiate athletics today.

The Association has two types of reserves, the funded cash reserve and the investment trust account.

The funded cash reserve is covered in full by cash or immediately marketable securities and currently amounts to \$90,343.54.

The Association now has established two investment trust accounts, consisting of government securities, corporation stocks and corporate bonds. The total amount of the two investment trust accounts is \$432,236.22. Our reserves and investments annually provide \$30,000 to our general income.

NCAA membership has passed the 700 mark and has reached an all-time high of 706. This includes 613 active members, 39 allied conferences, 30 associate institutions and 24 affiliated organizations.

New members which joined during the past year include:

Active

District 1

Windham College, Putney, Vermont
New England College, Henniker, New Hampshire (former associate)

Lowell State College, Lowell, Massachusetts (former associate)

District 2

Marist College, Poughkeepsie, New York
Hunter College, Park Avenue, New York, New York
New York State University of, Binghamton, New York
California State College, California, Pennsylvania

District 3

South Florida, University of, Tampa, Florida
George Mason College, Fairfax, Virginia
Louisiana State University in New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana

Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia
Albany State College, Albany, Georgia

District 4

University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois
St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota

District 8

University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California

Affiliated

Cross Country and Long Distance Running Coaches Association
California Junior College Association
Collegiate Ski Coaches Association

Associated

California State College, Dominguez Hills, California
Boise State College, Boise, Idaho
Roger Williams College, Providence, Rhode Island
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville, Illinois
Federal City College, Washington, D. C.
Husson College, Bangor, Maine

Mr. President, this concludes the report of the Secretary-Treasurer, including the printed audit, and I move that it be received. (The motion was seconded and approved viva voce.)

6. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

H. B. Lee (Kansas State University): Mr. President and Members of the Association: It is my responsibility to report to you on the activities of the Association's Executive Committee during 1968. The Executive Committee is composed of the Association's President, Secretary-Treasurer, Vice-President-at-Large and seven members elected by the NCAA Council.

Everett D. Barnes, our good friend and Past President of the NCAA, resigned from the Executive Committee last spring inasmuch as he was no longer connected with an NCAA institution. As you probably know, Eppy accepted the position of acting director of the U.S. Olympic Committee and performed most creditably in a difficult role.

One of the primary responsibilities of the Executive Committee is the Association's financial and business affairs.

Another major assignment of the Executive Committee is the supervision of NCAA meets and tournaments. During 1968, two new national championships were added to the schedule of events. The first annual National College Division Gymnastics Championships were conducted at Springfield College in Springfield, Massachusetts. The inaugural National College Division Baseball Championship was contested at Springfield, Missouri, with Southwest Missouri State College serving as host. Both events were successful in their first year, and the addition of these two national championships definitely enhances the Association's already successful and well established College Division program.

The Executive Committee conducted a survey of the Association's membership to ascertain whether there is a desire to add additional national championship events. As a result of the study and further investigation, the Executive Committee is sponsoring Bylaw amendments designed to create National Collegiate Championship competition in the sports of water polo and volleyball. Both water polo and volleyball are Olympic sports and have attained popularity among our member colleges. In our opinion, we must continually move forward in providing more competition for larger student bodies.

Amazingly enough, one of our biggest problems during the year was the trampoline and whether it should be retained as part of the National Collegiate Gymnastics Championships. There is strong opinion, both pro and con, about this event. The Executive Committee conducted a survey of those member institutions sponsoring an intercollegiate gymnastics program to gain the advice and counsel of athletic directors and gymnastics coaches. A special committee comprised of three members of the Executive Committee and two members of the NCAA Gymnastics Rules and Meet Committee subsequently discussed the problem in detail and reviewed information submitted by team physicians.

After considerable deliberation the Executive Committee, by a divided vote, decided that the National Collegiate Gymnastics Championships shall be contested in two divisions to be known as trampo-

line and gymnastics with each division to be scored separately. It was the opinion of the Executive Committee that this solution would be equitable to both sides. It would enable the proponents of the trampoline to have meaningful competition and yet give its opponents an opportunity to drop trampoline from their program and still be competitive in the sport of gymnastics.

To accomplish this, the Executive Committee is proposing an amendment to Article 5 of the Bylaws which will create a separate and distinct National Collegiate Trampoline Championship to be supervised by the Gymnastics Rules and Meet Committee. If the amendment is adopted, the event will be held at a time and place different from the National Collegiate Gymnastics Championships.

In other matters related to championship competition, the Executive Committee approved a two-year contract with the National Broadcasting Company involving the television rights to the 1969 and 1970 National Collegiate Basketball Championships. As this great event grows in stature, its television rights increase in value. The Executive Committee was satisfied with both the financial remuneration to be derived from the television contract and also the promotional program presented by NBC, which should help all college basketball.

Your Executive Committee is authorized to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Association's Constitution and Bylaws. Certain revisions in Executive Regulations were made during the past year and may be noted on pages 36 to 39 of the Program. (See pages D-1 through D-4.)

You will note Executive Regulation 2-12 was revised and allows NCAA championship competition to be conducted on Sunday if an emergency develops which causes postponement of an NCAA event, or if the competitive situation dictates a more expeditious completion of the meet or tournament. Advance approval for Sunday competition must be obtained from the competing institutions and the Association's Officers. This revision was prompted by a request from the NCAA Baseball Rules and Tournament Committee which administers district and national championship competition. I am sure you realize that rain and baseball don't mix. The new Executive Regulation will aid the Baseball Rules and Tournament Committee.

Statistical classification of member institutions was another major topic of discussion. Statistical classification is important in the sport of football because it affects an institution's eligibility for College Division championship competition. Also, statistical classification in baseball and basketball may not always coincide with an institution's competitive designation for NCAA events.

In an effort to conform the National Collegiate Sports Services' statistical classification program with developing NCAA classification procedures, separate statistical classification committees have been established for the sports of football, basketball and baseball. Each statistical committee includes representation from the various groups interested in the problem, such as the recognized writers' associations and the committees responsible for the administration of NCAA competition. The new statistical committees should prove helpful to reach an equitable accommodation between the legitimate interests of the news media and college athletic administrators. The

news media experts, of course, want to see that athletes vying for national statistical honors are meeting like qualities of competition; and at the same time, college administrators feel that they should have a fair voice in determining their competitive level.

Last year we reported on the reorganization of the Association's staff and operations. During the past year there was additional reorganization in order to develop an intensified program to increase publicity for NCAA events and to create a research center for intercollegiate athletics. Jon Foley, former sports information director at Springfield College, has been employed as director of promotions with primary emphasis on publicizing NCAA championship events. Louis J. Spry was named research director in addition to his duties as publications director. The Executive Committee also increased the National Collegiate Sports Services budget in order to develop a radio tape service and a daily electronic feed to television networks to more fully utilize the attractive college athletic personalities available to promote intercollegiate athletics.

Of interest to everyone serving on NCAA committees was the action to increase the per diem allowance from \$20 to \$25. Obviously, this has been well received.

The Association's Postgraduate Scholarship Program has been most successful. To encourage the program's further development, the Executive Committee increased the number of postgraduate scholarships to athletes in sports other than football and basketball from 22 to 32. The NCAA now awards annually a total of 80 one thousand dollar scholarships to outstanding scholar-athletes who desire to continue their education beyond the baccalaureate degree.

The Association was fortunate in having another successful year financially. The Executive Committee authorized use of some of the excess receipts for further research and study by the Association's Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports and by the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements. Again this year we authorized grants to various affiliated organizations. Coaches' organizations desiring to promote and improve their sport may apply to the NCAA for financial assistance.

The Association is constantly asked to contribute to various Halls of Fame. During the past year it was reemphasized that the policy of the NCAA shall be not to make financial contributions to sports Halls of Fame. We want it understood, however, that individual member institutions are encouraged to support those Halls of Fame in which they do have an interest.

The NCAA and its Executive Committee have observed with interest the development of the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. NACDA can serve a useful purpose to those engaged in the profession of athletic administration. We do not believe, however, that NACDA should become a policy-making voice in intercollegiate athletic affairs, and this matter has been discussed in some detail. Consequently, the Executive Committee directed Walter Byers to communicate with the Officers of NACDA regarding the necessity of maintaining an effective and orderly administration of intercollegiate athletics. We believe that all pertinent matters involved with intercollegiate athletic policy and administrative procedures should be pursued through institutional membership in the

appropriate national athletic organizations to which a college or university may belong.

Through the course of the year the Executive Committee has been apprised of all of the developments in connection with the Federation movement and the Sports Arbitration Board's proceedings. Inasmuch as President Plant has discussed this subject, I do not intend to review the proceedings in this area other than to say that the Executive Committee has endorsed NCAA membership in the newly formed U.S. Wrestling Federation.

Mr. President, I move that the report of the Executive Committee be accepted and approved, including the detailed accounting of our activities as recorded on pages 139-141, 142-148 and 162-168 of the 1967-68 Annual Reports and the revised Executive Regulations as set forth in the Convention Program on pages 36 through 39. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

7. REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

Earl M. Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Mr. President and Members of the Association: Our voting procedure here is most interesting. We vote either with the green or red, as I understand it. Our Officers caution us that there are no subtle implications of any kind in the use of these colors, no reflection on competence with green, no political overtones with red. If you are still concerned about the use of colors, you should know that the Officers considered and rejected yellow as undesirable. [Laughter]

It is a distinct honor and pleasure for me to present the annual report of your NCAA Council. This distinguished group of gentlemen is charged with the responsibility of guiding the destinies of the Association and formulating general policies in the interim between Conventions.

Intercollegiate athletics suffered a most unfortunate loss with the sudden passing of Bradford A. Booth, who for many years served as the faculty athletic representative from the University of California, Los Angeles. Brad was vice-president for District Eight and was one of our most dedicated and articulate Council members. He believed in excellence, both academically and athletically, and was a strong influence on the Council. He will be missed.

Nineteen sixty-eight was, of course, an Olympic year. Last January, the Council adopted a resolution stating that any young man who was enrolled at an NCAA institution during the 1967-68 academic year and who qualified for the U.S. Olympic team would be eligible to represent his institution upon return from the Olympic Games even though he may not have been enrolled at his college or university during that term. The Council took this extraordinary action because of the dates of the Olympic Games. It was necessary for many college students to miss the first semester or first quarter of the 1968-69 academic year in order to represent their nation in this international competition.

I might add that the NCAA and its member colleges and universities can be proud of the significant contributions and achievements of its student-athletes during the recent Olympics. The success of the United States' team in Mexico City again emphasizes the role of the intercollegiate program in maintaining and advancing

this nation's athletic strength.

Continuing in the area of international competition, the NCAA appointed 19 representatives to serve on games committees of the U. S. Collegiate Sports Council during the past year. The USCSC, of which the NCAA is a member, is responsible for this country's participation in the World University Games. We are pleased to report that the games committees are now functioning and the United States is hopeful of sending a strong team to the World University Games, tentatively scheduled for late August of this year.

Through a resolution of this assemblage at its 1968 Convention, the NCAA reactivated Bylaws 7B and 7C, which require track and field gymnastics meets sponsored by noncollegiate entities to be certified by the Association's Extra Events Committee. I am pleased to report that the vast majority of privately promoted track and gymnastics meets applied for NCAA certification. The Extra Events Committee reviewed each meet on the basis of merit, and as a result most of the meets were certified. It is interesting that the AAU's Indoor Track and Field Championships is one of the meets certified.

The American Broadcasting Company, which televises the Association's college football program, requested that the NCAA Television Committee amend its sponsorship restrictions in order to permit beer sponsorship. The Council subsequently authorized a mail referendum of the membership to determine if beer sponsorship should be permitted for the 1969 college football television program. The referendum failed to produce the necessary two-thirds majority, and as a result the Television Committee's proposal was defeated.

It is pleasing to note the general acceptance of the 1.600 rule as a constructive piece of legislation. Both the Council and the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements have given close attention to the administration of the rule during the past year. At this time, 546 institutions have confirmed their adherence to Bylaw 4-6-(b). The majority of institutions, 377, use the national prediction table with 90 institutions using conference tables and 79 preferring institutionally developed tables. A total of 67 active members are not eligible for NCAA competition because they have not filed Bylaw 4-6-(b) declarations of one type or another.

In order to provide for a more uniform administration of the 1.600 legislation, a number of interpretations have been adopted by the Council and are brought to your attention for endorsement at this Convention.

Pursuant to the actions of the 1968 Convention, all member institutions must use either the SAT or ACT tests in establishing predictability and scores compiled on other tests shall be invalid for purposes of determining predictability. In addition, the Council is submitting to this Convention the proposed interpretation that the only tests acceptable for establishing predictability shall be those ACT and SAT tests taken on nationally administered test dates.

A further word about test scores might be said at this point. Test scores, as you know, form only one basis for the development of our prediction tables, the others being actual rank or grade point average. These two factors were proposed by our Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements since together they provide the quality of prediction superior to either test score or high school record.

On this matter your Council requested the Committee on Academic Testing Requirements to study minimum testing work and influence of these scores upon the issuance of prediction tables at local, regional and national levels.

To insure that prediction tables are valid and up-to-date, the Council has voted that new national, conference and institutional tables shall be developed and on file for approval in the NCAA office by September 1, 1969. The new tables will be effective for enrollees entering after the fall term of 1969. Subsequently, conference and institutional prediction tables must be brought up-to-date every three years, the national table every five years. The Convention's approval of this decision will be sought Wednesday.

Another important development is clarification on the use of high school rank. The Council has adopted an interpretation for review here that in the development of new tables only high school or preparatory school rank in class shall be used for prediction purposes. If the high school or preparatory school certifies in writing that class rank is unavailable, the prospect's grade point average may be used to establish prediction through the use of an NCAA-approved conversion table.

There are other interpretations to the 1.600 legislation which appear in your Convention Program on pages 32 to 34. The Council's activities in this area during the past year have been designed to insure that all institutions will apply Bylaw 4-6-(b) in a like or similar manner.

One of the more controversial actions of the 1968 Convention was the adoption of the rule which enables freshmen to compete in National Collegiate Championship competition in all sports except basketball and postseason certified football contests. You will recall that the house was almost evenly divided on this issue. This year the Council is proposing a compromise revision of the rule for the consideration of the membership. The amendment endorsed by the Council (see Amendment IV-D, page B-6) would enable institutions to use freshmen on varsity teams in all sports but football and basketball. NCAA competition, however, shall be confined to those with sophomore, junior or senior standing except for the existing College Division exception in Bylaw 4-2. Regardless of freshman participation on the varsity, all students shall be entitled to three years of NCAA competition. This differs from the previous rule which penalized a student one year of NCAA competition if he participated on the varsity as a freshman. The Council offers this to the membership as a middle ground accommodation of the different views on this subject.

We are scheduled to have an interesting round table discussion this afternoon. In the past the Association has offered three or four topics for the consideration of the membership at the general round table. This year, however, we will focus on one subject and it is important: "The Rising Cost of Intercollegiate Athletics."

During the past year the Council appointed a Special Committee on Recruiting to discuss that important area of intercollegiate athletics. The Committee is broad in its scope and encompasses the viewpoint of the faculty athletic representative, conference commissioner, athletic director and active coach. The Council had an

opportunity to review a progress report of the Special Committee on Recruiting and offered its comments and recommendations. A progress report by the Committee on Recruiting will be included in the round table discussion.

The Council also appointed a Special Committee on Junior College Relations. The Committee held a joint meeting with representatives of the National Junior College Athletic Association and the California Junior College Association to discuss areas and problems of mutual interest. We have before us at this Convention one amendment and one official interpretation inspired by that meeting, both of which were endorsed by the two junior college organizations.

The amendment provides another exception for junior college transfer students for purposes of NCAA competition. If a student predicts 1.600 or better on the national table upon graduation from high school but chooses to enroll in a junior college, he will be immediately eligible for NCAA competition if he can present a 2.5 grade point average and 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit from the junior college.

One proposed interpretation (see O.I. 112, page C-5) is perhaps more far-reaching in its effect. It deals with the student who does not predict 1.600 upon graduation from high school. If such a student decides to enroll in a junior college, he must be able to present a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500 in order to be eligible for financial aid, competition and practice insofar as the 1.600 legislation is concerned. The Council believes that this is in keeping with the intent of the 1.600 legislation. It is certainly in keeping with the things we see developing on the junior college front throughout the nation.

Another special committee established by the Council was an advisory committee to assist the Football Rules Committee. Many of those involved in administering intercollegiate athletics are concerned with the increasing cost of sponsoring football. As a result of a resolution adopted by the college presidents of a member conference, the Council established an advisory committee to insure that the viewpoint of those responsible for administering intercollegiate athletics is made known to the Football Rules Committee. The Council was fortunate in that it named to the committee three gentlemen who have had significant experience in the sport of football and are former coaches themselves. The advisory committee consists of A. D. Kirwan, acting president of the University of Kentucky; Robert Bronzan, director of athletics at San Jose State College, and Garvin Beauchamp, dean of students at Abilene Christian College.

In connection with the sport of football, the Council wishes to remind you that 1969 shall be the Centennial celebration year for this great intercollegiate activity. A special committee, composed of representatives of all segments interested in intercollegiate football has been hard at work developing plans for the Centennial year celebration. If college football's Centennial is to be successful, we must rely upon the talent and resources of our member colleges and universities. The Council urges all member institutions to cooperate in recognition of this significant event.

Your Council has been most conscious of the student unrest that

has occurred on many of our college campuses. While recognizing that there are areas for improvement in our society, we do not believe it is fair or just for a small group of individuals to disrupt an athletic activity which is conducted for all participants. As a result, the membership was notified in September that an institution may terminate the financial aid of a student-athlete if the student-athlete is adjudged to have been guilty of manifest disobedience through violation of institutional regulations or established athletic department policies and rules applicable to all student-athletes. Examples of actions which could be construed to be manifest disobedience are disruptive actions which interfere with the normal and orderly conduct of an institution's athletic program, refusing to meet the normal good conduct obligations required of all team members and defiance of the normal and necessary directions of departmental staff members. Equal treatment of all squad members is an absolute requirement in the administration of this provision.

It is understood that any proposed cancellation of aid for reasons of manifest disobedience must follow the procedural requirements of Official Interpretation 2-(c).

The Council is on record as strongly endorsing the report and recommendations of the NCAA Professional Relations Committee. The Council is proposing an amendment which will make it an institutional violation for a member college's athletic team to appear on a doubleheader program with a professional athletic team. We also favor elimination of the use of college facilities by professional sports teams and as a result have strengthened the language of the Association's Recommended Policies and Practices.

Also, the Council went on record urging the elimination of the practice of athletic dormitories through the adoption of a new Recommended Policy. If we truly believe in the separation of professional and college sports, this is a minority practice which should be eliminated.

The Professional Relations Committee report emphasized a point which deserves mention here. It is necessary, if we are to accomplish the aims and objectives of providing an intercollegiate program which augments our educational system, to maintain a strict separation between intercollegiate and professional athletics. All too often individuals, primarily coaches, are anxious to associate themselves with professional sports without realizing that it is detrimental to their own program. We hope that all member institutions will be cognizant of the Professional Relations Committee's work in this area and give favorable consideration to the Association's Recommended Policies and Practices regarding relationships with professional sports.

The year 1968 has been a good one for the National Collegiate Athletic Association. There are many people who can be commended for outstanding service, but I know that I speak not only for the Council but the entire membership in applauding the work of our outstanding officers: President Marcus L. Plant and Secretary-Treasurer Ernest B. McCoy. Mark and Ernie, your colleagues on the Council offer sincere thanks for a job well done.

Mr. President, I call the Convention's attention to the record of the Council's 1968 meetings on pages 132, 141, 148 and 168 of the

1967-68 Annual Reports which are in the hands of the voting delegates plus the record of our October meeting printed on pages 57 through 72 of the Convention Program. I now move that the report of the Council for 1968 be received except for the proposed interpretations on pages 29-35 of the Convention Program which will be considered Wednesday. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

8. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS

Aloysius B. Begley (Providence College): Mr. President and Members of the Association, The Committee on Memorial Resolutions, besides myself, were William Exum of Kentucky State College, and John E. Faber of the University of Maryland. The Committee presents the following resolution:

"Be It Resolved: That we, the delegates to the 63rd Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, pay sincere and heartfelt tribute to the following members of our Association who dedicated their lives to the betterment of youth and the cause of intercollegiate athletics and who have been called from this world since our last national convention:

Winston Bobb, faculty representative, Furman University
 Bradford A. Booth, faculty representative, UCLA
 Reverend James Carey, athletic director, Seton Hall University
 Monroe Carroll, faculty representative, Baylor University
 Drew Spurgion Cherry, University of Florida
 Kermit Cissell, equipment manager, University of Maryland
 Floyd A. Crow, Baylor University
 Ralph B. Draughon, president, Auburn University
 Herman Einstein, lacrosse, Drexel Institute
 Robert Allison Fetzor, athletic director,
 North Carolina State University
 Edward L. Finnegan, athletic director,
 Western Reserve University
 Earl Hamilton, football, Dartmouth College
 George Hauser, football, University of Minnesota
 Carl E. Higgins, director of special events,
 Louisiana State University
 Frank Hill, track, Northwestern University
 Willis O. Hunter, athletic director,
 University of Southern California
 George Jacobs, athletic director, St. Michael's College
 John H. Kobs, baseball, Michigan State University
 Benton A. Kribbs, athletic director, Bucknell University
 Emil Larsen; commissioner, Border States Conference;
 University of Arizona
 George Hubert Lockhart, Alabama State College
 Carl J. Lundholm, athletic director,
 University of New Hampshire
 William H. Martin, basketball, Virginia State College
 George Marshall, track coach, Eastern Michigan University
 Malcolm E. Morrell, athletic director, Bowdoin College
 William Kelso Morrill, lacrosse, Johns Hopkins University
 Laurence A. Mullins, athletic director, Marquette University

Lee McLaughlin, football, Washington and Lee University
 Covington McMillan, football, Clemson University
 Oscar B. Nelson, basketball coach, Parsons College
 Carl Patterson, gymnastics, Temple University
 Jack E. Rider, swimming coach, City College of New York
 Henry J. Rottschaefer, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 N. Kerry Thompson, football, Slippery Rock State College
 Warren O. Thompson, faculty representative,
 University of Colorado

Oswald Tower, Williams College
 Howard A. Wheeler, athletic director, Belmont Abbey College
 Rolland Williams, basketball coach, University of Iowa
 Robert R. Wilson, athletic director & faculty representative,
 Kentucky Wesleyan College
 George Cecil Woodruff, Jr., football, University of Georgia
 Alfred J. Wyre, head trainer, University of Maryland

And Be It Further Resolved: That this expression of our esteem and sympathy be extended by the Officers of this Association to the families of our former colleagues with the assurance that their memory and their contributions are esteemed and valued.

Mr. President, I respectfully request that the members of this Convention stand in a moment of tribute to these, our former colleagues. (The assembly then rose and stood for one moment in silent tribute to their departed colleagues.)

(The Convention recessed at 11:45 a.m.)

COMBINED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES AND ATHLETIC DIRECTORS ROUND TABLE

Monday Afternoon, January 6, 1969

The Round Table convened at 2:05 p.m., Ernest B. McCoy, Secretary-Treasurer of the National Collegiate Athletic Association from Pennsylvania State University, presiding.

Chairman McCoy: I am sure you are all well aware of the subject of our round table discussion this afternoon, "The Rising Costs of Intercollegiate Athletics." It is the feeling among athletic administrators that the cost of intercollegiate athletics is getting completely out of hand. Everyone seems to agree, and it is our sincere hope that through discussion of some of the factors that are stimulating these costs may be able to offer some solution. (The Chairman proceeded to introduce the panelists.)

Our first panelist is Mr. Edwin Cady, faculty representative at the University of Indiana and also chairman of the special NCAA Committee on Recruiting.

Recruiting

Edwin H. Cady (Indiana University): I think all of us miss the late Bradford Booth. He was a fascinating friend. He was a very valuable colleague. But I suppose I miss him particularly because as far as I know he and I were the only two English professors in this outfit. I feel lonely.

It is rather strange that an English professor should be standing here talking about costs in intercollegiate athletics or even costs in anything. Certainly I have no extraordinary professional competence to do this sort of thing, but perhaps I can think of one reason why I should be here. It is one question that isn't entirely to be left to deans. It is possible that intercollegiate athletics are too important to be left to coaches and directors. Another way of saying it is that what we are doing in intercollegiate athletics is not and must never be considered to be a thing of costs. It is part of the organic whole in each of the institutions we represent. It is part of the life of the institution and it is part of the life of the academic community, and we have always got to consider it in such terms as that.

If it were not for this fact, if it were not that so many more things than simply dollars are concerned, then the problem might be very quickly solved by the competent directors of athletics who abound in this organization and around the country.

Before I talk about the work of the Committee on Recruiting and its relationship to the topic of today, I thought it might be useful to talk a little bit about some of the considerations that have been going through my mind as I have tried to figure out what in the world the meaning of all this is.

I suppose an English professor's business is trying to figure out what they are talking about. There is a famous remark in American literature that was made by Herman Melville, the author of "Moby

Dick," in trying to balance the terrible stress, about his attempt to meet the best kind of argosy he could, and attempt to meet the bills and meet the payments. He said, "Dollars damn me."

One of our problems is going to not be damned by the dollar. Of course, we have to consider the dollar. Of course, we have to meet our budgets and meet our bills. Of course, we have to consider all the things which may bring on a major crisis not only to intercollegiate athletics but also to institutions of higher education all over the country. And yet we cannot be damned by the dollar.

Another way of saying this is that the costs of intercollegiate athletics are never exhausting dollars; there are always other considerations.

We need to look to the cost, for example, in nondollar fields. The thing that I think is always first and last as a consideration is, "What happens to the student-athlete?" We have to look upon our institutional relations internally. It is a touchy area which is going to get a lot touchier in the immediate years ahead.

We have to look toward our actual values. If we can feel clear about what we are doing as a matter of morals, as a matter of integrity, as a matter of values, we are going to be much more able defenders of what we do and what we decide, than if we are not clear. If we are a little shaky we are not going to convince the people who are going to need a lot of convincing in the years ahead. And we have always to look to our reputation, to our good name, and many of you are aware that this is becoming a major problem, and not just in athletics but also in a great many other things.

We have to look to the future of our full athletic program. We have to look to our future as a total. We have to look to long-term as against short-term results in what we do.

Now, these are largely truisms. You have heard them many times before, but I visualize a kind of background to the proposal, and I am aware it has a kind of vagueness to it in the circumstances.

I am convinced that in the long run—and I am not sure it will be a terribly long run—we are going to be forced in many of our institutions to a decision which some of the other institutions have long since taken, and that is to adopt the program of intercollegiate athletics in competition in the full membership in the university family. The practical outcome of that is to say that our programs of intercollegiate athletics are going to have to be supported in part by institutional funds.

Many of us have existed for a long time on the very clear distinction that there was never to be any thought of institutional support for intercollegiate athletics, that they must be completely dependent on income, that they were never to be recognized either in fine terms of value or quite practically as being members of the family. I think the trustees and the presidents of our institutions are very rapidly going to have to face up to this. I think another way of saying it is that they are going to have to take us into the family or they are going to have to throw us the dole.

I don't think these are Utopian or frivolous considerations. I think they are sober and consistent.

It is an obvious fact, obvious to the kind of decision I am talking about, that there are two great, fearsome beasts, as in "Pilgrim's

Progress." There is the elephant standing there, and a dragon here.

The immensely escalating costs for academic institutions are in a sense destroying university administrators all over the country. There is no doubt about the fact that one of the major factors leading to the rapid mortality in their positions as university presidents is continuously escalating costs.

It is also widely rumored that the next target of what generally you refer to as the New Left in the country is to be the English Department and the athletic programs.

To deal with the dragon on the New Left, the answer seems simple enough—we have to fight him. There are no two ways about it. There is no way out of it.

The other way, in the short term, is going to be very attractive to all of us. That is try to find the budgetary palliative, short-term economy, which is going to look pretty good on the balance sheet. The truth of the matter is that if you can find a way to save \$10,000 or \$50,000 or something of the sort next year on your budget, if you are a director of athletics you are going to be very strongly tempted to do it, and your president will be grateful and so will your trustees. But I suggest to you that you won't solve your problem, and that you had better consider very carefully what the prices are, what the nondollar prices are, of the palliative, and the reason the palliative is only a palliative, the reason it is only a short-term gain, is I think pretty simple.

The biggest problem a good many of us have in the so-called major, big-time programs is grants-in-aid. The whole system of grants-in-aid has placed a very heavy burden on the budget of the department of athletics, and the cost of the grant-in-aid program escalates all the time because academic costs are escalating all the time. It is also true for a good many businesses. We get more and more students with full standing and get less and less income.

The point I am trying to make is we have urged, for example, the policy that freshman eligibility in the nonmoney sports will help us economically. It is a palliative. As I hope to show, at least to some degree, there are possibilities in the revision and the reform of recruitment rules of saving money. It is a palliative.

There has been a good deal of talk about the return to single-platoon football. There are certain reasons which I suppose are basically apathetic why I would like to see a return to single-platoon football. Economically, it is a palliative. One way of saying it is the money you save that way is peanuts in the face of the total budget of the department of athletics and the money you save by reform or freshman competition is the soul of the peanut. Nothing major will come about from it.

I very much fear the program of restraining grants-in-aid to the money sports. You will all be able to think of various drawbacks to that.

We must not betray our athletes. We must not betray our programs. We must not corrupt ourselves in a world where it is so difficult to resist the corruption anyway, and we had better be clear about what we mean when we say that we are going to save money, that we are going to cut costs.

I do not believe—and I must say this is a change in both my hopes and my convictions—that in the foreseeable future we are going to be able to do away with grant-in-aid programs for reasons of integrity and equality of competition. We are going to have to look for acceptance and adoption into the family.

The Special Committee on Recruitment has found itself proposing three major revisions of our rules on recruitment. We hope to bring these to you for enactment possibly with other proposals no later than next year, partly because our institutions and conferences were concerned and partly because we discovered that the high school associations and conferences were much concerned about recruitment of athletes.

The first rules we attempted to write had to do largely with visitation.

The first proposal was on home, home locality and high school visitation.

A. The first intent of this rule is to limit official recruiting visits to a prospective student-athlete's home and its locality by the following provisions:

(1) Visits in the home by a coach or by any officially designated representative of the athletic interests of a member institution are limited to a maximum of two;

(2) For a coach or an officially designated representative of an institution's athletic interests to interview, entertain, or seriously converse with a prospective student-athlete and/or his parents in the home locality shall constitute a home visit in the sense of (1) above, but home and out-of-home entertainment and interviews in one continuous action shall constitute only one home visit.

B. The second intent of this rule is to maintain a clear distinction between a recruiting visit and permissible contact between a coach (or officially designated representative of an institution's athletic interests) and a prospective student-athlete within the context of normal high school activities, whether academic or athletic. Governed by the rule of civility,

(1) there shall be no such contact inside the school except (a) by previous appointment made through the principal and (b) after school hours (and such an after-hours appointment in school shall constitute a home visit as in A-(1) above;

(2) there shall be no such contact at the site of a high school athletic competition under any circumstances.

No coach or officially designated representative of an institution's athletic interests may visit a prospective student-athlete in his home, home locality, or high school before the prospective student-athlete's completion of his academic junior year in high school.

The second proposal has to do with campus visitation.

The intent of this legislation is to limit the number of paid visitations to a member institution by any prospective student-athlete to a maximum of two. The official visit paid by funds of the institution may be supplemented by a visit for which transportation may be provided by an alumnus or an officially designated representative of the institution's athletic interests who ac-

companies the prospective student-athlete. The two visits may occur in either sequence of time.

In addition to the two permitted visits with subvention, a prospective athlete may visit a campus at his own expense as often as he wishes; but no expense or entertainment may be supplied him on such a visit except a maximum of two complimentary tickets to a campus athletic event.

No institution or officially designated representative of an institution's athletic interests may invite or subvent a prospective student-athlete's visit to a campus before the prospective student-athlete's completion of his academic junior year in high school.

The third has to do with appropriate entertainment during campus visitation.

This rule is based on the premise that the justification for an expense-paid campus visitation is to acquaint the prospective student-athlete (hereafter called the visitor) with the facilities, patterns of life and atmospheres normal to student life on that campus and its environs. It is therefore the intent of this rule to encourage fulfillment of the purpose of campus visitation by the following provisions:

1. The visitor shall live and take his meals on campus as regular students normally do;

2. His entertainment shall take place in company with regular students and be conducted by regular students and on-campus.

EXCEPTIONS: (a) Should normal facilities and entertainment not be available, local commercial facilities may be used, but at a scale comparable to that of normal student life; and (b) Off-campus entertainment may be afforded the visitor only at a rate of incidence and at a scale of cost consonant with normal student life.

3. No cash shall be given the visitor for any purposes;

4. No automobile shall be lent to or placed at the disposal of the visitor;

5. A requisite part of the visit shall be one or more interviews between the visitor and (a) a representative of the registrar or entrance office of the institution, and (b) by a member of the faculty not employed by the director of athletics.

We have had a number of helpful suggestions about these rules, and I solicit your response to them. I speak for the Committee in saying we would be very grateful for your suggestions as to the possible change of text or things we overlooked.

It has already been pointed out to us, for example, that we overlooked the whole question of entertainment for people who might accompany the prospective student-athlete.

The Committee also would be very grateful for your suggestions as to what further topics we might take up.

We have had a number of suggestions about trying to limit the number of campuses a prospect might visit. A lot of people have said, "See if you can't tie him down to visiting just five places." The Committee talked about this and thought pretty hard about it. We have argued sometimes about the change in the restrictions that we are presuming to place on young American men, and there is always the

problem of enforceability of the rules. If any of you can think of a really good way to write a rule which would get something like that done, I think we would be very happy to look at your proposal. [Applause]

Grants-in-Aid

Robert C. James (Mid-American Conference): Several years ago I noted the appearance of an unusual number of editorial writers commenting on the increasing costs of our colleges and universities. Two articles in particular stirred my curiosity; one by William Steif, Scripps Howard staff writer, and the other by Henry J. Taylor.

Mr. Steif's article was titled "Colleges Want New United States Aid" and presented the following points:

"The nation's colleges, distressed by ever-rising costs, are launching a drive for a new kind of federal aid to make up for operating deficits.

"Leaders of the seven major college associations—representing public and private universities, liberal schools and junior colleges—have agreed to push for the new federal aid.

"The colleges want federal money unencumbered by special earmarking so they can use it where it is most needed. Such institutional grants would be over and above all other federal programs.

"If institutional grants were depended on to make up operating deficits, they could run as high as two billion dollars a year."

Fred H. Harrington, president of the University of Wisconsin, said many of the nation's 2500 colleges were "near the breaking point" where they either had to raise tuitions and fees drastically or start rejecting large numbers of students. He is President of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, whose 100 member institutions enroll almost a third of the nation's students. Of interest to me was just what effect this would have on our intercollegiate athletic programs should such grants not be forthcoming from the Nixon Administration. To properly judge the effect it was necessary to review the increases in college costs in recent years in our member institutions. While all of us are aware some increase has taken place, I doubt that many will fully appreciate the extent of the cost increase to our budgets as a result of the increase in tuition, room and board charges by our respective institutions.

Slide No. 1 shows the basic student charges by institutions of higher education. The data presented was prepared by the Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare from published charges to a resident full-time degree-credit student. The survey covers fifty states and the District of Columbia.

For comparison purposes we have divided the survey into two four-year segments, the first covering the years 1961-62 to 1964-65, and the second covering the years 1965-66 to 1968-69. The increases indicated in the year 1961-62 are the increases in those costs from the previous academic year.

Another comparison we might make which reflects the consistency of the increases in costs is that of the land-grant college survey from the years 1963-64 to 1968-69, with the information listed above for the comparable years. The trend indicates that charges by non-public institutions will increase at a much higher rate than charges

by publicly controlled institutions. The rise in estimated average basic student charges is influenced primarily by tuition and required fees, although room charges have also been a factor. The charges for board, in comparison with other charges, have been held on a relatively even keel. Board and room are ordinarily considered to be services for which a fee is charged that is directly related to, although not necessarily equal to, the cost of the service.

Tuition and required fees are the primary source of funds for educational and general purposes in nonpublicly controlled institutions. The publicly controlled institutions' source of educational and general funds are primarily from state governments. Tuition and required fees in publicly controlled institutions are only approximately one-fourth of the income from state governments. Income from the Federal Government, designated for research, in the four-year institutions, exceeds the amount received from tuition and fees.

[Slide No. 2] Although the basic student charges nationally were of interest to us, of greater importance was how the increases in costs affected our seven member institutions. This slide shows the cost of a grant-in-aid (tuition, room and board charges only) by our seven member institutions and the changes from 1961-62 to 1968-69.

Bear in mind, this is not the average grant in our conference. This is the average cost of the resident student charges. In the nonresident student charges, as indicated in the survey published in nonpublic institutions in the first slide, we compare our nonresident students to the nonpublic students in that survey and our cost increased from \$1370 to \$1904, or a 37 per cent increase. [Slide 3]

In our conference we have authorization for a maximum of 125 grants of tuition, room and board. This slide offers a comparison in the cost of 125 grants for the two four-year periods, 1961-62 to 1964-65 and 1965-66 to 1968-69.

For example, from the time this boy was a freshman, in 1961-62, until he graduated in 1964-65, the bracketed number reflects the number of grants that we would have had in addition to the 125 had our costs been based on the 1961-62 year, and during that four-year period, as you can note, we had an average gain of cost of nine grants, whereas in 1965-66 to 1968-69 we had an average cost increase that would have been comparable to 25 grants.

[Slide No. 4] Taking the total for the two four-year periods, you will note the average of those institutions increased in that period of time to their budget for 125 grants of \$48,520 or an increase of 39.4 per cent. In terms of grants-in-aid, this increase represented the cost for 49 additional grants when using the 1961-62 base figure.

I think you will recognize an athletic director can and should be charged with the responsibility for judicious expenditure of funds under his control, such as salaries, supplies, expenses and equipment. However, in one area of great expense, that of grants-in-aid, he has no alternative but to commit the funds necessary to provide for the increased costs. Frequently these cost increases are effective during the course of the school year long after he has meticulously prepared a working budget and such increases in student charges may or may not be absorbed into that budget without a deficit operation. That we should be concerned greatly with this area is shown in the following quote from an article by Henry J. Taylor:

"The costs of everything keep going up, but nothing like college costs.

"Indiana University President Elvis J. Stahr has pointed out that while the cost of living has risen 20 per cent in the last decade, student charges nationwide, primarily for tuition, have risen 80 per cent.

"The average University of Indiana student must spend \$2,000 for a nine-month year there. This includes tuition, room and board, books, special fees and incidentals; all necessary costs of college.

"Moreover, if you have a baby in your family, that child will be ready to go to college in 1986. By then, at the rate the cost of education is increasing, it will cost parents an estimated \$25,000 to send that child through a four-year college course.

"During the past 10 years college and university budgets have increased at the average rate of 10 per cent a year. During the next 10 years, in line with costs, college tuitions are expected to double."

Slide No. 5 projects the cost for the next four years, if the increase in costs remains the same, which is highly unlikely.

Since we made this slide one of our member institutions increased its tuition \$90 a year during the course of the year. As I said, frequently the cost increases are effected during the course of the school year long after the athletic director has prepared a working budget.

Exactly how much college costs will increase no one really knows. It is obvious, however, that they will continue their upward spiral. Additionally, it is also obvious the increase will have a drastic effect on the type of program we can conduct. I think it is fair to presume that our institutions will be faced with deciding if they really want an athletic program, and if the answer is in the affirmative then they must contribute to its support as they do to any other desirable phase of the university. [Applause]

Spring Football Practice

Ralph A. Ginn (South Dakota State University): Perhaps you would like to open your Convention Program and review the proposed amendment of permissive legislation in regard to spring football (see Amendment VII-A, page B-12).

I speak to you as a retired football coach, and I have gone through 22 spring football practices. I would like to say that I enjoyed those 22 spring practices. I don't know whether our squads enjoyed all of them, but I think most of them did.

I have coached without spring football, and I thought the additional time we had in spring practice helped our football. But I want you to bear in mind that this proposition is permissive legislation.

This suggestion was made several years ago by a former great football coach at one of our fine institutions in America, who suggested that at that time we do away with spring football and add ten days of practice in the fall. So our suggestion contains this number of ten days. If you practice twice a day, of course that would be the equivalent of twenty days of spring practice.

I had the privilege of serving on the College Committee for a num-

ber of years and frequently we heard comment from people in regard to spring football practice. Some of the suggestions were made in all sincerity, and they were not all critical of spring football practice either.

The majority will probably agree that to eliminate spring football practice for those who want it would thereby stimulate more participation and interest in the traditional spring sports. This is probably more of concern to the College Division schools. As to whether it would save a lot of money, I think probably it would not. It would help or relieve staff members for duties in other sports or other duties during the spring, so it might save a little in that way.

It might save the cost of the equipment. I doubt there would be very much saved there because probably they would practice just as much in August as they would in the spring.

I have heard many people say that we have more injuries in spring practice than we do in fall practice, but I have not been able to find any research or figures that bear that out. I know from experience that we do have some injuries in spring and we also have some in the fall. Probably some of you have definite feelings along that line from your experience.

In regard to the ten days provisional practice for schools who do not have spring football, ten days might not be the exact number. As I mentioned, it would be the equivalent of twenty days for spring practice, as we could have double practices in the summer, in August. Maybe we would not need ten. Maybe eight days would be better. I don't know that there is anything sacred about ten days.

I am sure that all of you immediately have the idea and the question in your mind that this would increase the cost to bring these boys back for eight or ten days more of practice in August, and I am sure that it would. To keep a football squad out of season costs money. Also your staff would start to work earlier, although I think most of our staff members are working on a 12-month basis.

To help defray this cost, our proposal includes the proposition that if a school does not have spring football and starts earlier in the fall, they would be allowed to play an extra game. Whether this should be the tenth game or one game in addition to the tenth game probably can be argued, and there would be good reasons on both sides, but our proposition suggests that the school is allowed to play an exhibition game during the last week of August or between the last Saturday in August and the first Saturday in September.

I think at the present time we have the finest football we have ever had. It is costing more money, but more boys are participating. Whether this would improve football or not, I don't know. I am inclined to think that it might. I think spring football did improve collegiate football, but additional ball practice would improve football some even at the present level.

The athletes would have greater interest as it would be more meaningful at that time.

This additional game would be necessary for the morale of your squad. Most of us who have coached football find it very difficult to keep a squad on a high level of achievement and improvement for a great length of time. Approximately 20 days is about as long as you can go and not reach diminishing returns.

It is our opinion that this proposed game could bring in enough revenue to take care of the increased cost.

College football is in competition with other forms of football, and so far we have kind of left August clear for high school football and professional football. In some sections of the country August is a good time to play football. In fact, I note a lot of exhibition games by professionals are played in the South where it is very warm at that time of year and it doesn't seem to make too much difference.

I think this proposition would be very valuable to the schools that play freshmen in football. The freshmen coming in would have a more even chance to make the varsity squad. In spring football, you cover some things you don't have to cover quite so thoroughly when you get together in the fall. Freshmen would blend into the varsity squad more easily.

Remember, this is a voluntary program or permissive legislation.

How do our boys feel about spring football? How many of your football players would come out for spring football if it was voluntary?

Will this improve college football or would it cause it to deteriorate to some extent?

I am sure this is a very controversial proposition. Through the years I have heard many comments in regard to spring football. This gives the members of the NCAA an opportunity to express themselves, and it is a permissive legislation. [Applause]

General Trends

James G. Barratt (Oregon State University): My presentation will be concerned with the rising cost of athletics and possible solutions. The possible solutions, I might alert you, are mine and not necessarily those of my conference.

This topic becomes even more critical after recent Pacific-8 legislation, such as:

It was voted last September that the Pacific-8 Conference join with other NCAA members and conferences so inclined to have the NCAA Football Rules Committee adopt substitution rules which would require players to play both offense and defense. The motion passed 7-0 with one abstention.

The presidents and chancellors of the Pacific-8 voted to engage in a thorough study of the role of athletics at member institutions with emphasis on the cost of the program, sources of revenue, and means of determining what constitutes a well-balanced athletic program for the various institutions at all levels; intramural, club and intercollegiate. Such a study is to be conducted at each institution in a manner to be determined by the president or chancellor.

So, gentlemen, there it is; a threat to two-platoon football, a threat to have our programs taken over by nonprofessionals. And we all know that a battle between the athletic director and the president is about as one-sided as the one on the Little Big Horn between General Custer and the Indians.

The descriptive words "escalation" and "spiraling" used in talking about the costs of athletics are about as commonplace as the words "bread and butter" at home. These words are hideous when we com-

pare them to our bread and butter—intercollegiate athletics. Athletics is too beneficial to be placed under ominous shadows which can bankrupt our programs if they are not met and dissipated.

What are some of these shadows?

At the threat of the statement, "Figures lie and liars figure," I present the results of a questionnaire assembled by Pacific-8 Commissioner Tom Hamilton, using statistics compiled by the eight athletic directors of our conference. We used a ten-year and a five-year survey. The five years from 1962 to 1967 compare the costs of single-platoon football to two-platoon.

Ten years ago in 1957, all but one of our eight institutions operated on athletic budgets of under one million dollars, and five years ago only two budgets were over one million. In 1967 and now, all eight are over one million, two are approaching two million, and one is over the two million budget figure.

None of the eight received any tax money.

The trend is alarming. In 1957, football gate receipts were bearing 64 per cent of the load; in 1962, 57 per cent of the load, and in 1967, only 46 per cent of the total load.

Right now, three of our eight schools are operating on a deficit budget. I have been told that many of our major conferences have as high as six of their athletic departments operating in the red. How long can they exist?

It is interesting to note that the Pacific-8 Conference institutions average 12 major sports, financed through intercollegiate athletics, while all have various means of aiding large-scale programs called club sports or recreational sports. Our average school in the Pacific-8 helps support 20 of these sports.

Some of the costs are inherent to educational costs and go up with the national averages. These include coaching salaries, secretaries and staff which advance along with the national trends.

Since the advent of two-platoon football, the cost of athletic equipment has risen 34 per cent while travel costs are up over 35 per cent, each at the rate of seven per cent a year. At the same time, football budgets have increased 46 per cent or at the rate of 9 per cent a year. Here's the shocker—over the past 10 years, financial aid and recruiting expenses are up each about 150 per cent, for an average of 15 per cent per year. At this rate of escalation, many of us will soon be out of business. Remember, our cost of living has only risen about 4 per cent a year.

And now, speaking of my own experiences at Oregon State University, I offer these comments:

Despite the fact that the three past years have been the most profitable in our 100-year history, due to some great coaching, some outstanding teams, three television appearances, and a larger stadium which resulted altogether in larger fan interest, I face the future with pessimism. Without an annual regional or national television appearance, we might be on a deficit budget commencing the next school year. I am sure that many of you out there in the audience will be with me.

All of us are guilty of trying to keep up with the Joneses. If our major opponents hire another football assistant coach, we try to match them. If our major opponents have more football scholarships

than we have, we try to catch up. If a major opponent shops for an artificial turf, we start organizing a fund-raising campaign. This goes on and on.

It is now time for our colleges and universities to work through our NCAA for a solution of limitations, before half our football teams are sidelined through actions of our presidents, chancellors and faculty. If we don't take proper action now, many of our coaches will be out selling real estate and insurance within five years.

I have often said that the coaches keep their jobs by winning, and the athletic directors keep theirs by balancing the budget. We are now faced with the dilemma of keeping our programs within what we can afford, or else there won't be any programs to worry about.

Some of you have probably been thinking, this speaker hasn't even mentioned what athletics are doing for the colleges and universities along the lines of recreational sports, new facilities being used by the students and faculty financed by athletics and our grants to minority student programs. We all have our isolated examples where the college or university has received sizable benefits due to athletics. At my own university this past month, the president received a donation of \$500,000 to use at his discretion from a person whose actions were prompted by his love of intercollegiate athletics. However, if your athletic department goes broke, will you be bailed out by your university? I doubt it, as our universities are also hard pressed for cash.

In conclusion, I have several possible solutions which I think can save our sport of football in particular, and our departments of athletics in general. These possible solutions are not unique from those you have discussed with your own people, but are advanced with the hope that you will give serious consideration for the betterment of all our programs.

After visiting with literally hundreds of fans, sports writers and coaches, I am convinced that we must save two-platoon football. We have too good a game encompassing too many thrills to discard it. I feel it costs us at Oregon State about \$100,000 annually for this fringe benefit, and another conference member projects the figure at his school up to \$200,000. If we retain two-platoon football, it will mean making other sacrifices, such as:

(a) A national limit of not over 90 football scholarships, including freshmen. This should include an escape valve where injured players are not included. At my school, where we currently have 123 football scholarships, our head coach, Dee Andros, says he could operate on a total figure as low as 80.

(b) The NCAA limit on financial aid should be lowered to include room and board and tuition, but not books and \$15 monthly. Any boy can earn enough in the summer to pay for his books and incidental expenses.

(c) An early signing date for the football letter of intent, not later than March 15, as an aid to cut down the recruiting time and costs of your staffs.

(d) An NCAA limit on the number of full-time assistant coaches for football, with a realistic figure of seven or eight as a maximum.

(e) An attempt by the athletic directors to schedule all sports other than football and basketball where all competition will be regional, until time for conference and national championships. I am a great one to be advocating this, as my wrestling team just returned from a jaunt to New York State.

On the other side, what can we do to increase our incomes? Several suggestions have been advanced which I will comment upon.

(a) Raise football ticket prices. I am against this as I feel we are at the saturation point now. We charge \$5 reserved for football and \$6 for the big game. I think that is plenty.

(b) Play an eleven-game football schedule. I am against this as we play two games annually before our students are in classes. Except for Bowl games, I feel the college football schedule should be completed by Thanksgiving.

(c) I am for a job of salesmanship before our collective student bodies urging compulsory student fees to support athletics.

(d) And, as my comments suggest, I am for a program whereby we practice economic discipline on a national scale, because nobody has ever been able to keep up with the Joneses.

Chairman McCoy: Gentlemen, you have heard our discussions. I would like to suggest it might be on the side of wisdom for all of us and all people like us in our professions to consider some of the things that Mr. Barratt has suggested; that we look at our programs and our institutions within our conferences and on a national basis and see what economies might be made.

It would not be wise for us to look for financing, which might be so termed, to expect the university to be willing to take over the athletic department and support it as it does other departments within the university in its entirety. If the university did this, may I suggest to you, and I am sure you will agree with me, it could be quite a traumatic experience.

I suggest that your grants-in-aid could be reduced. I suggest that your traveling squads could be reduced.

So before we reach that stage it might be wise to seriously look at the problem and see if we cannot get together on these different bases and draw some of the restrictions within our midst.

May I say you cannot operate on 20 scholarships a year. Penn State has won 19 straight football games and it takes 25 freshmen a year. The president of West Virginia, the president of Syracuse University, the president of the University of Pittsburgh and the president of Penn State sit down each year and review the scholarships. The only exception in football is if a boy is injured in preceding practice or during the first ball game we may apply to the other three institutions on the regular form, signed by the athletic director and the medical staff that this boy is through for the year, and he never again can put on a uniform or attend practice or any meeting until spring practice turns around. It can be done, but it requires other people to join in.

Robert Peck (Boston University): It seems to me our greatest challenge is going to be the charge that intercollegiate athletics is not really a part of the educational program. I think we have many instances today where it isn't.

One thing we can do is to give aid on the basis of need. Many

schools are doing it. If it was brought up for consideration by the whole Association that we give financial aid on the basis of need, I think we would be free of the charge we are paying the boys an allowance to go to college. If we can eliminate that, I cannot see why this would hurt any of our institutions. They would be on the same competitive basis. We would all go through the same Association.

This would make our programs none the less competitive, but very much more educational in that each man would be accorded an opportunity to come to the university. It would eliminate one of our points that I think is weak.

Mr. Cady: I have a comment or two to make on that, mostly as to the logic.

You have to face the fact, first of all, that our athletic enterprise is part of American culture. It isn't just part of something abstract that can be called higher education. Our facilities in particular are inclined to react and say, "This isn't a cultural factor. Can you make it culture according to your heart's desire as you go along, or present it at the moment, or something of the kind?" These things, of course, are just not true.

There is no doubt about the fact that we live in a kind of cultural story and change, and at least on the part of some people hopefully revolting; they are pretty revolting I find.

But I won't agree with you that the argument has to be made on the basis of favoring, let's say, football as a part of the educational process.

You can quite clearly say that the University of Chicago has lost none of the essentials as an academic institution by having done away with football. I don't see how you can get around the obvious evidence there. But I think that is taking hold of the wrong handle.

Historically, football was developed essentially and brought along in the evolution within the American colleges, just like basketball, for example, because these are expressions of the kind of communities we have in our institutions of higher education.

Anybody who thinks the only important things going on in the university are what is happening in the classrooms and the libraries and the laboratories simply has no sense of reality.

For years I have been saying to students, as a professor, that all I ask from them is an even break. If you have 50 per cent of their energy and their enthusiasm and their imagination and their creativity in the classroom you would be doing just fine, and they would have the other 50 per cent for education in these other things, which is one of the most important things that happens to the university. That is why it is important to have a university, to have a campus. That is one of the things lacking in correspondence courses, television, and so forth in trying to educate people. So it is the academic community, and it is the amalgamated academic community within the American culture which has given us what we have.

It seems to me that trying the so-called need factor program would be disastrous. One of the primary reasons it would be disastrous is that we would be bucking our cultural realities.

Mr. Peck: But not on the national basis. You are talking about the individual conference.

Mr. Cady: We have to buck a good many things, including the

NCAA a number of times and got away with it pretty well. On that one, we were dealing with athletes, with faculty, with alumni, with student bodies, with sports writers, with the whole shebang, none of whom understood or had any sympathy for this.

Mr. Peck: I don't really think you spoke to what I said. If we tried it on a national basis—and I don't have any hopes of it in the near future, but I think it ought to be put up for discussion—with the kind of safeguards and what you do in other aspects of the program, you would be bucking no one. You would still get the boy who needed a full ride. The boy who needed \$1000 or a lesser amount would have to pay the difference and his parents would be able to do it or he would be able to do it in any school in the country.

Chairman McCoy: I can say to you, sir, that the people in this room and many others have spent long hours in discussion, long hours of soul searching, long hours of research, covering practically the subject you are bringing up.

If my memory serves me correctly, it was defeated on the floor of this Convention because there was some question as to whether it would work nationally. However, I would suggest, if enough people feel that way, this floor is open and such legislation can again be proposed if it has merit.

Dean S. Trevor (Knox College): I have worked under five college presidents and each one made it very plain that the cost per student is the thing that really causes college presidents problems. I haven't heard anything said about the costs that are spent for giving the boy the so-called education for three or four years so he can play football and never get a degree, which means we can't teach or he has a problem.

Furthermore, I would like to know approximately what it costs the student in order to play the game of football or basketball. I think those are the costs that some of us don't have but might be valuable to solve some of the problems that the larger schools have.

Chairman McCoy: The cost per student credit hour is a big problem. How do we arrive at it except by institution examination?

Thomas J. Hamilton (Pacific-8 Conference): I can testify, as has been done, that there has been a great deal of soul-searching in the area of rising costs, and this is not the end of it. This is going to go on, and I relate it to a danger that this is going to leave the hands of competent athletic and faculty people who know the problem and know the situation. Therefore, some of the remedies and solutions should be delved into rather carefully.

Having been a member of the Football Rules Committee, I am very conscious, as Fritz Crisler pointed out, that this is a very responsible group of men. They tackle their problems very conscientiously, but when the two-platoon rule or free substitution rule was returned, the statements at that time were that there would not be a rise in costs, there would not be increases in coaching staffs or playing squads. I think everyone realized there was a bit of tongue-in-cheek in the matter. But the cost has gone up. Jim (Barratt) has given you our statistics at least to prove the point.

I am hopeful that we will ask the Rules Committee to study these problems in their own way.

I do submit that we have had some experiences in the past season

or seasons which duplicate what happened in 1950 and 1951. We have seen these unbalanced games. We have had more 63-7, more 50-8 scores, and this is most discouraging. The schools want to perform with fine athletic programs and fine football teams. They want to be able to compete on the level that they are used to.

Going back to 1950 and 1951, it was the same sort of situation which caused many institutions to drop football, and I hope we are not coming to that point again. But certainly we should study the matter as carefully as we can and ask the Football Rules Committee to do the same.

Chairman McCoy: Only yesterday afternoon, John Waldorf, chairman of the Football Rules Committee, and David Nelson, secretary of the Rules Committee, discussed with the NCAA Council some of the problems we are talking about, such as two platoon football. As a result, the Council has now named a committee of three to sit as an advisory group with the Football Rules Committee.

We have started the wheels rolling to get the Rules Committee to look at this problem.

Harold W. Lahar (Colgate University): Some of the instances Mr. Hamilton is talking about are true, as far as the increased coaching staffs and increased squads are concerned. It is also true that we have also had some pretty lopsided games, but we have also had a year of some of the most exciting games ever seen in college football. We have had a lot of 28-21, 39-29, 23-20, 35-40 games. We had a great football game on New Year's Day which was in part strengthened by the fact that we do have increased coaches and increased squads.

It takes more coaching to coach 125 football players or 130 football players and you need 125 or 130 football players when you have teams that scrimmage against offensive teams and teams that scrimmage against defensive teams.

We can put a national limit on the number of athletes that come into the institution with financial aid and whatever it is, if it is 25 a year for football we can live with it because we can still play football. So if it is a matter of the more boys you have the more you have to coach, this is where it should start.

I speak as a member of the Rules Committee, and I know I have to sit down and thresh this out, but I think there would be a very excellent place for the NCAA to begin as far as the size of the squad and building the staff, irrespective of what rules they play under. [Applause]

Marshall S. Turner, Jr. (Johns Hopkins University): Professor Cady said that intercollegiate athletics, more specifically football, is not played in a vacuum but as a part of American culture in American educational institutions. He then mentioned people, sports writers, alumni, students, people who he said wouldn't let us do what we know we ought to do. Did you mean that, and if so, what can we do to get these people to let us alone so we can do what we know we ought to do?

Mr. Cady: One of the things that interests me is the difference between the American experience in university sports and the experience of all the rest of the world. There are some comparatively small aspects of British university life which conform somewhat to American experience.

I was speaking to a British friend and colleague the other day about this, and I said to him, "Do people in Britain really get interested, for example, in the great university Rugby matches?"

He said, "Oh, yes, some of the matches and some of the cup matches get really huge crowds."

I said, "How many?"

He said, "Oh, four thousand people."

I said, "I know there is great interest in the rowing matches. How many people come?"

He said, "You can't tell. They line the banks and that sort of thing, but there must be over 20,000 at national events."

Beyond that, as far as I can tell, the connection between the great American public and the American university which takes place as a result of our athletic enterprises is about parallel. For example, in a state like Indiana, which is not very big, not very rich, not very populous, Indiana and Purdue are supposed to have, what shall I say, academic affluence which the Sorbonne has, but probably would not come to within 50 per cent of the Sorbonne.

I am not prepared to say they do this because of athletics, but I know of no phenomenon which connects the citizens of the state to those universities remotely compared to the athletic phenomenon.

What I am saying is that it is a fascinating wide-open area for research and study. But I must say, in a moment of frustration about this sort of thing, I think we all feel if we could just get the faculty representatives and the directors and the coaches together and everybody would let us alone we could solve all our problems in 30 minutes, but that is pretty unrealistic because they are not going to let us alone. We do have to live in the context of our society, and in this I wouldn't want to be let alone.

Harry Arlanson (Tufts University): As a member of the Football Rules Committee, I would like to make this comment. Each year we have one change that seems to be very important. A year ago it was bench rules. Two years ago it was the shift. This year, without question it is the substitution rule. Principally I rise here to disagree with my colleague, Hal Lahar. I feel that to limit the number of players is a rules change. There is a great deal of appeal in this and the Rules Committee is looking for assistance because we would like to know what to pass on. The Rules Committee would like very much to hear from you.

Kline R. Swygard (Oregon State University): This is related to the proposal to amend the Constitution, Article 3, Section 10 (see Amendment III-A, pages B-1 and B-2).

If this legislation does go through, as apparently it has every chance of doing, do you feel, Jim (Barratt), that the 120 grants-in-aid currently in effect at Oregon State, could be reduced to 90?

If we look at this legislation that is before us, it would appear that the red-shirt situation will be increased and not decreased because the transfer will matriculate after three semesters. Therefore, redshirting will be increased and costs will increase.

Mr. Barratt: This is an assumption. We are not too high on redshirting except where the youngster has a five-year college course. There is some redshirting going on, but I am sure our faculties are not too high on the practice.

Ray Ellickson (University of Oregon): I have been assured by many of my coaching friends that they will not let the redshirt boys in. I am not at all convinced that is the case. In my opinion, there are many coaches who will and it will develop in many institutions. In the Pacific-8 Conference, institutions that allow redshirting start out with maybe two or three and end up with 25 or 30. I think something can be done not only in our own conference but in many others if we adopt the rules such as are proposed.

Mr. Swygard: Maybe I didn't make this clear because there is a complex issue involved. Obviously, the redshirting is to allow individuals to participate in football games who would not be declared eligible. One of the implications here would be that the boy would be recruited after three semesters and probably not have 48 units. Therefore, he will be a redshirt and instead of lowering the cost of the program we are holding the level or increasing the cost.

Mr. Barratt: I don't think that a limitation of 90 includes redshirting. The only escape valve would be on the basis of no redshirting.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): The price we must pay in solving this problem is going to be worth it. We should endeavor to solve this problem in the institutions. The interest in intercollegiate athletics among our respective institutions, even if it must be afforded or financed or subsidized, will be worth it.

We have the desire for improved health conditions in our country, the desire for providing youngsters otherwise not having the opportunity for an education.

We ought not to let our colleges and universities forget the contribution athletics has made to this country, the solid ground of development of the athletic programs in our colleges and universities. We ought to try to do all we can through this Association to preserve the level at which it exists today. If it means some restricted rules in regard to football, I certainly would be in favor of it.

I want to be on somewhat of a positive note in conclusion, in saying whatever price we must pay, it is worth it. There is a feeling of gloom going around here, and I shudder at it. I don't think it is quite that bad. There are bright things to look forward to, and I think the people represented here are going to find a way to solve these problems.

Chairman McCoy: It would be well if we would not forget what we have talked about, that we take it home to our institutions and look at our own plans and our own programs; that we take it into our conferences and we bring back to this Convention some suggestions, resolutions and amendments that might be accomplished by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and the Football Rules Committee. [Applause]

[The session adjourned at 3:55 p.m.]

COLLEGE DIVISION ROUND TABLE

Tuesday Morning, January 7, 1969

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 by the Chairman, James H. Witham, University of Northern Iowa. Mr. Witham explained the purpose of the Round Table and subsequently introduced the members of the College Committee.

Chairman Witham: If you will turn to page 85 of your 1967-68 Annual Reports, where the report of the Vice-President At-Large, Bill Ketz, is printed, I would like to call your attention to the results of the change in Bylaw 4-6-(a). Bill championed the so-called "fish or fowl" legislation and his report illustrates the effects of the new rule. After the legislation became effective, 81 "hybrid" colleges or universities selected the University Division, whereas only about 31 came down to the College Division, which indicated to Bill that this caused these people to seek their level. In other words, they went into the University Division, and they will no longer dominate some of the College Division events. I am sure Bill feels that this is going to equalize competition to a greater extent than in the past.

[Chairman Witham then introduced the members of the various panels and indicated the subjects to be covered.]

Basketball Tournament Format

Walter L. Hass (University of Chicago): Gentlemen, I am sure all the athletic directors and basketball coaches got copies of the National College Division Basketball Championship Handbook. Based on the premise that a good many of us do not read it completely, I am going to tell you again about the changes in the format of the National College Division Basketball Tournament, and some of the reasons for them.

The first thing the Committee did in meeting in San Francisco last summer was to divide the country into eight areas, and we will have one chairman at each area. As you remember formerly we had four areas with two regional tournaments in each area.

These changes and others were made after looking over the results of the survey conducted by the Committee among all member colleges. In the eight areas, we tried as nearly as possible to have an equal number of teams in each area. If you will look at the map you have in your booklet you will notice in some areas there is considerably more area covered, but the number of teams in the College Division in each area is nearly the same.

At least three teams from each particular area will be in the area tournament. Unless it is absolutely necessary, there will be no "swing" teams. There may be a swing team going into an adjacent area in a case of emergency, but there will be at least three teams from that particular area in the tournament.

The next change in the format has been in the method of determining the quarterfinal pairings. A seven-year, round-robin has been

devised in which each area will play each other area in the quarterfinals in that seven-year period, and also each area will be in the same bracket with each other area at least two more times during the seven-year period.

Previously the pairings were set up so that there were always four eastern teams in one bracket and four western teams in the other bracket, and they would only meet in the finals. Under the new format, a New England team may play a California team or a West Coast team and the Mideastern team play a Southern team in the quarterfinals at Evansville and they will be in the same bracket with that area two more times.

We have eliminated, at least for the coming year, automatic qualification for a conference champion. There are many reasons for this. I won't go into all of them now, but in view of the new format we discovered a lot of conferences overlapped different areas. We discovered that there were only four or five conferences at the time of our meeting that had really applied for automatic qualification.

The finals of the Basketball Tournament will be held in Evansville, Indiana, on March 12 through 14; the regionals on the seventh and eighth of March previous. The sites have not been set but will be set by the Committee after the teams have been selected for the tournament. (Mr. Hass reviewed the eight areas and the area chairmen.)

Each of these gentlemen has selected an advisory committee in his area to assist in surveying teams.

I became chairman of the Basketball Tournament Committee in September. Dick Koenig of Valparaiso had been chairman for four or five years. I think all of us on the Committee and those who have had anything to do with College Division basketball would like to add a note of commendation for Dick whose leadership and—I hate to use this word because I think he won't like it—dynamic drive have had a great deal to do with the success of the College Division Basketball Tournament. I might say it was financially, artistically and in every other way a success last year.

William H. Wright (Norfolk State College): Has any consideration been given by the Committee to rotating the national tournament throughout the regions and not always having it at Evansville?

Mr. Hass: Yes, that has been talked about quite often, but I believe we have two more years to run on our contract with Evansville.

Richard Koenig (Valparaiso University): May I offer a suggestion to you? If any gentleman in this room has a site to suggest it would be most helpful to the chairman, because while there are two more years to go on the contract, the Committee soon will have to start negotiating.

Third Competitive Division

Cecil N. Coleman (Fresno State College): The College Football Committee feels that the objectives which were initially set up for the College Division Football Championships have been reached; that is, we think it has helped increase the interest and attention of the public in the support of football. It also has with the College Division institutions.

One objective we think has been short-changed in that everyone has not been given an opportunity to participate. Unfortunately, it

has been the smaller schools that have not been able to compete with schools where they have around 15,000 or 20,000 students.

At a meeting last June in Kansas City, the Committee tried to develop some criteria which might be embodied to make a better tournament, a third division, or another ball game for those institutions that have not had an opportunity. We considered several things, but the one that stood up under the most rigid test was the private schools versus state schools.

The Committee decided early last year to conduct a survey among the member institutions to find out if they were interested in this third division or private division. All we did was ask for an indication of interest, and from the Pacific Coast region we had 22 institutions stating they were interested; from the Midwest we had 41; from the Mideast, 58; from the Atlantic Coast, 55.

We need an expression from those who are interested today so that we may recommend to the Executive Committee that we begin one, two, or three regional championships.

It is felt that these games should be played on the Saturday before Thanksgiving or one week earlier or later, and that they shall be played at the site of one of the institutions.

Francis Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): As chairman of the College Committee at the time this particular program was established, we would like to say we are pleased to see how it has grown and prospered.

I would like to suggest to the Committee there are some state institutions that are small, perhaps smaller than some of the private institutions, and when the Committee gets ready to propose specific legislation perhaps they might consider the possibility of enrollment as well as a private versus state criteria to take care of the smaller state schools.

Mr. Coleman: I should have indicated that the College Football Committee will not come up with any criteria like that. We talked to many people and there are not criteria that are valid enough to cover every situation that exists. It will be done through self-determination. Naturally, if we have someone like San Diego State saying they want to play in the private division, that could not work out.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): In the Atlantic Coast Area you gave the figure of 55 schools who indicated interest in this third or private division. From what number did you solicit on your replies?

Mr. Coleman: We had 55 answer in the affirmative; 27, no; 39 did not reply; 80 thought they were in the wrong division; and 1 was undecided. This includes all the College Division institutions in the Atlantic Coast Region.

Mr. Turner: How many would you classify in this so-called private division?

Mr. Coleman: At that time 55 indicated they were interested. Now, we have not gone on from there, Marshall, to determine how many of that 55 would actually qualify.

Mr. Turner: So there is still a question as to how many of the so-called private division schools would actually be interested in such a competition.

Glenn W. Arnett (San Fernando Valley State College): I would like to anticipate a little. I am concerned with the timetable for basketball. What is the anticipated date you might say for basketball, baseball and other sports?

Chairman Witham: As far as the College Committee is concerned, we have only talked about this. I think we want to try it in football first.

Mr. Arnett: It would appear off the top of an outstanding basketball tournament structure that it would be easier to implement in basketball than football, which may or may not be having financial problems throughout the country.

Mr. Hass: We haven't talked about a third division among the Basketball Committee. I am inclined to agree that perhaps basketball would be a little bit easier to settle. I am not sure.

Edgar A. Sherman (Muskingum College): It pleases me to hear the discussion taking place, and I hope someone will pursue it. I am very favorably impressed. I am concerned that the 27 who voted negatively are not going to be a deterrent, and I would like to ask a question. Of the 27 who voted negatively, did you divide them according to size?

Mr. Coleman: No, I didn't.

Delegate: We are interested in the third division, but the state colleges in the Middle Atlantic are not like the state colleges of the Midwest or the West. Many of them are smaller than some of the private schools. Most of them have been teacher training schools. Some of them are moving to the liberal arts. We would like to have this group represented in the third division.

The other point I would like to make is the majority of these schools have no grants-in-aid whatsoever, except the tuition is slightly lower.

Mr. Coleman: I would like to make the point that of all the criteria we discussed, this was the one that appeared to be more valid than any of the others, although there were a number of exceptions, so we did not preclude the possibility that there could be state colleges in this third division. There is no question about that at all.

Kenneth B. Knox: (Southeast Missouri State College): I think basically the observations that have been made are confined to the Midwest. I am quite happy with the College Division expansion, but I have observed in the Midwest that the state institutions have either large enrollments or large financial aid programs. You cannot divorce them completely, although I think the deciding factor is the financial aid. It leaves two other groups somewhat in the fringe area—those schools which have modified financial aid, whether scholarship or sports program, etc., and those which have no financial aid.

When I responded to this questionnaire, I felt the third division would serve a very vital purpose in the last two areas. Private does not strike me as being the proper name, but that is neither here nor there at the present time. The classification, as I see it, will be the major problem.

I doubt if we can classify on enrollment. It seems to me we have to make it a little more in regard to financial aid.

The individual institution should have the opportunity to deter-

mine if they desire to participate in the "upper" division. This would take care of the peculiarities of certain institutions.

This is a knotty problem. I feel this is an area that a vast number of schools would like to be a part of. It would open up postseason competition for them, which is of value, and it seems to me we should make it available to more groups.

James C. Loveless (DePauw University): I would like to suggest there may be another criterion of importance here, that is, how the athletic program is financed. I think if the program is financed through the general budget of the university or college you will discover a division here that is rather distinctive and important.

Chairman Witham: May we have an expression by a show of hands of those people who are here who are interested in the so-called third division for football? It looks like it is pretty much unanimous.

Now in basketball? [The majority raised their hands.]

How about baseball? [A minority] Not quite so many, but at least there is an interest.

Charles M. Neinas (NCAA Staff): Some of the gentlemen raised the question why more work had not been done on investigating the third division possibility for competition in other sports. I thought maybe some of the rest of you might have the same question.

I think the reason we are looking at third division football is that the stated purpose for the College Division football program was to give College Division institutions a postseason opportunity and also to improve and increase the stature of College Division football and bring more public awareness to the fine caliber of football played in the College Division.

In the sport of football, there is a segment of the membership that is not being given a postseason opportunity. While there may be inequities in basketball and baseball, the same cannot be said there, because although some of the sports may be dominated by the larger state colleges, smaller colleges do have an opportunity to compete in the tournaments. In basketball in particular last year we had 36 teams involved of which there were a number of colleges with a smaller enrollment that did get the opportunity to compete. In football that is not true. It has been primarily dominated by the larger state colleges.

Freshman Rule

Chairman Witham: Let's go to our second topic which is to allow freshman participation in all NCAA schools in the sports of football and basketball; in other words, to eliminate the exception of football and basketball.

Lysle Butler (Oberlin College): I will first of all comment that I was a little bit amused by the vote on championships. It is getting so if you are negative you don't even get a chance to vote anymore. They just asked a show of hands of those who were in favor of the third division. [Laughter]

The question of eligibility for athletes is an old one. Colleges have found it necessary to set up controls as they assume jurisdiction over the extramural programs that have been originated and developed for students. At the time intercollegiate athletics was getting organized the purpose of education was to train the mind, and as a

result the student was required to maintain a satisfactory average to participate in athletics. Consequently, intercollegiate athletics from the beginning necessitated an approach toward controlling eligibility, and at the rate we are going now in a few years we will need several large cross index volumes of rules of eligibility for participation in intercollegiate athletics.

I propose we start eliminating regulations that are devised to promote equality of competition since we cannot really do this anyway. We should have a more positive approach of offering a few suggested policies which are needed in determining bona fide students. Most of us in this room represent colleges that can operate very well without all the legislation the NCAA has built up. All we need is to believe and practice that belief, that athletics are educational and should be controlled by the faculty the same as any other educational opportunity offered.

The faculty needs to do only three things: (1) to control the standards for admission to college; (2) to set standards for academic study, for the selection of the amount of academic work, including athletics, and (3) to exercise complete autonomy in grading the students.

The conferences can set up any additional controls they desire, and the regional or smaller conferences can be more flexible, shade more easily, and yet enforce more readily. Large national athletic conferences, such as the NCAA, need to decide their primary purpose is to initiate and maintain high standards for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. When national conferences try to decide all eligibility regulations for the individual student as well as the institution for the regular season play and also for postseason championships you end up with the barrel of snakes that we now have.

Therefore, my answer to the question of allowing freshmen to participate in football and basketball would be that we shouldn't try to answer this question on the national basis at all. Let each individual institution in the athletic conference decide for itself. Athletics are provided by your institution as an educational opportunity for participation. There is no reason to limit the participation. Any bona fide student should be free to elect football, the same as a course in history. We need to get back to the business of promoting participation instead of restricting it. [Applause]

Stanley J. Marshall (South Dakota State University): I am not old enough to be very wise, therefore, I have the right to change my mind. A year ago I voted against making freshmen eligible for competition at the varsity level, and I have now changed my mind for these reasons: We have today student-athletes who are considerably different from the persons we dealt with several years ago. The student-athlete is much better prepared academically to go to college, for several reasons—flexible schedules, new math, and all of that. I believe the academic programs at the high school level have accelerated more rapidly than at the university and college level. He is in better shape academically.

The 1.600 rule—and we go by the national table—eliminates at least some or more of the risks that we used to bring in.

A young man comes to the college or university with a more diverse travel background. He has been around the block. The trip to

your campus is not his first trip out of town, as it once was.

The effect of television has been miraculous. He has seen a lot of athletic contests, if not in person, on television.

He is worldly wise far beyond the young man who used to come and needed protection. Socially, he is better adjusted than he once was.

Second, there have been some changes in the intercollegiate athletic program. We have fewer and fewer young men willing to come out for sports without some form of aid, and rather pragmatically I think we need to look at that and say, "Well, from the educational point of view you cannot do that," but I think we must.

In our conference we have a limit of 45 grants for football and 15 for basketball. We try to maintain a good program and compete very well in the College Division in both sports. It is difficult to run a freshman and varsity program in football on 45, and the same holds true for 15 for basketball.

It seems to me we get more for our money by utilizing the freshmen as they come in. Also your coaching staff's needs, especially in football, are somewhat less. You do reduce the number of participants, and I don't like that. You do pick up some flexibility.

I am not so naive as to think we will get very many freshmen in football in our conference that will help very much. We will get some. Also we can move a lad up and down from junior varsity to varsity as the need arises which we could not do with the freshman arrangement.

We have some other precedents on our campus. Typically, a student coming in is allowed to spend untold numbers of hours in drama, speech, in band and other activities, often as much time and even more than we ask for in athletics, and there is not too much concern there.

In consideration of the academic side, sometimes the regimentation of varsity athletic programs is good for the student rather than detrimental.

For this reason I believe the North Central Conference can look to the direction that freshmen can and should be made eligible for competition in all sports. Five or ten years from now it will be done across the country, and we will look back to the old freshman rule about the way we look at the Model-T Ford today.

Delegate: Are we talking about freshmen being eligible only in the College Division?

Chairman Witham: No, it is the consensus of the College Committee to make them eligible across the board. This would allow any school or a conference, such as the Big Ten, to say "no freshmen."

Delegate: I am talking about two sets of criteria. In many instances some of the larger conferences have tried to conform their rules to the NCAA's, but it is possible for a boy to be eligible for the NCAA and not in his own conference.

Clarence Von Eschen (Beloit College): I would like to have someone give the rationale for basketball and football being exceptions in the freshman rule.

Chairman Witham: This question was asked last year on the floor of the Convention. At the time the answer was, "We didn't think we could get the rule through if we included football and basketball

but probably they will come back next year and ask for football and basketball."

Delegate: If you want the history of why it was done go back about twenty years. Obviously, there was a great deal of emphasis on the financial situation in football and basketball and many institutions were having a great deal of success with freshmen who never got to be sophomores. You would find in football 22 or 23 freshmen with plenty of experience in the old semipro days of football. Every town had semipro teams, and there were excellent teams being filled with just freshmen. This was also true in basketball.

This is one of the problems, in spite of the fact that we may look at it in a different light. But it does open the door, particularly now, for youngsters who are not meeting the standards, and you could find some outstanding basketball teams made up largely of freshmen.

Mr. Marshall: One of the reasons I changed my mind is that it is ridiculous for freshmen to come in and compete in varsity cross country, indoor track and outdoor track, then tell the basketball player, "You are not ready; you cannot compete as a freshman."

I would be against this regional proposition. That would really be a barrel of snakes. I hope eventually, if not now, we will make freshmen eligible across the board and also in the University Division.

M. R. Clausen (University of Arizona): I am somewhat of an interloper in the College Division. In regard to the freshman rule, let me say I came from the Big Ten. When I first went to the Western Athletic Conference, I laterally was allowed to use my freshman athletes, despite the fact that the Western Conference four or six years ago did permit freshmen to compete in other sports than football and basketball.

After three or four years of this I couldn't discern what the bad thing was that was supposed to happen.

I hope our colleagues in the College Division who think a lot like some of us in the University Division will help keep ourselves unified. I hope at least this year we hold what we have. I agree with Stan Marshall, but I think you are going to have to educate some of the University Division people as to what does happen, particularly in regard to your experience in using a freshman football player to start before school begins in the summertime. These are some of the things I am sure we do not understand, but I believe if there is not a step backward this year, gentlemen, that the Big Ten and others who are opposing using freshmen at all will come with us.

I hope the College Division and the University Division stay together, because we are thinking very much alike.

James Roberts: This will be a hardship on the independent school if each conference makes up its own rules on using freshmen. You cannot use freshmen against this conference, but the next one will say it is all right.

Mr. Marshall: I think you are right. I think it would be a great hardship. Frankly, about the only thing I can see left on the side of not permitting freshmen to compete is some philosophy and tradition. We have had that position in our conference and we have stood on it, and frankly it seems to me that is all we can stand on, tradition; it is the correct thing to do; the good schools do it. But if you

examine it critically it doesn't have much to offer.

A. C. Bundgaard (St. Olaf College): It seems we have lost sight of one point; that is, when we went to the limit of 1250 men to play freshmen and beyond that freshmen could not compete in the College Division. This was to bring a measure of equality among the schools. If we vote freshmen eligible in all sports we wipe this out.

The only salvation for the little guy is the third division all the way through. This is one of the critical areas of our College Division competition. To some of the newspaper people it is almost a joke. They say, "College Division, small college—what is it?" There is little equity put there. I hate to see us lose it if we don't displace it with the third division.

Mr. Marshall: The limit of 1250 enrollment is one of the problems we have in the North Central Conference. We have two institutions which have fewer than 1250 males and the conference does not permit them to use freshmen. This is probably wrong. It would probably give them a better opportunity. But our conference sees fit at the conference level to permit them to use freshmen. This is another reason why we decided, "Look, they want to use freshmen, and it is good for them. Let's make it across the board."

Lysle Butler (Oberlin College): I would like to speak again of one factor. I think we spend a hell of a lot of time and energy trying to keep the other guy out so we can have equal competition. I don't think you can do this. I don't think it is possible. There are too many factors over which we have no control and we don't want to control them eventually.

You take the size and prestige of the institution, the size and prestige of the coaching staff. How do you hire your coaches? Do they do any other teaching? How much do you pay them? How much film allowance do you give them? How much money is available for you in the athletic program? Do you have a ten or twenty thousand dollar program or a half-million dollar program? The variations as to coaches and administration and faculty are terrific. How do they react? We have no control over the recruiting policies of the institutions. We set up a lot of recruiting rules, but there are all kinds of variations of practice.

How much time does your coach spend off practice, two or three months or no time at all? These are the things that are difficult to control. The policy on the control of athletics, tutoring, uniforms, all your admission policies, academic standards of the institution, these are the things that determine the excellence of a football program, and you don't touch them. Instead, you stand and argue whether the freshmen should play or not. I think it is the wrong attack.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): Lysle has been speaking in general terms. I think almost everybody heard Jim Barratt of Oregon State refer in yesterday's round table to the institutions keeping up with the Joneses. We heard Ed Cady refer to the alienation of the public and sports writers and so on, and he didn't want to do it alone. I think this is the problem. As long as we can do it together and each keep our Jones level at the proper place, this is fine.

When Lysle first spoke he made reference to the fact that this

could be done locally, regionally or at the conference level. I think in a sense this is what conferences try to do; have everybody play as nearly as possible at the same level. This is fine, so long as that is all you are going to do, but the minute you want to move into national competition you have to be sure that you are keeping up with the Joneses. This is where the pressure comes. You have to give up some of the in-season rules if you are interested in national competition. This moves national legislation for NCAA events into the in-season rules covering your eligibility for participating students throughout the year.

If we didn't have a national championship program we could do a lot of things by legislation at the local level and everybody could keep up with the Joneses pretty easily.

Dick Koppenhaver (Mankato State College): I think athletics is under attack from a number of areas. I think a boy should be eligible to play regardless of the number of students in the institution.

Kenneth B. Knox (Southeast Missouri State College): The problem is in two basic areas. First, I have heard persons argue that freshmen should not be allowed to participate because they will not attain perfection and will not have time to study and make their grades.

My observation has been that the individual who gets involved in activities, athletics and similar activities, seems to be the student who matures the quickest and makes his mark, so to speak, and you lose less of those than those you tend to segregate with their own level.

The other problem area is economics. We are kidding ourselves if we don't think a freshman team increases costs; in facilities, coaches, travel and financial aid.

The caliber of the athletes that most of us have need as much chance for development as possible. They will develop faster and to a higher degree if they are allowed four years of contact with the problems.

James C. Loveless (DePauw University): We get in the College Round Table and we talk, it seems to me, about unrest among blue chip boys on the freshman squad. We are for freshman participation for an entirely different reason.

Over the years we feel that more boys get an opportunity for another year of football. This is true in all sports. Maybe in football it is more dramatic at this point.

We don't have the blue chip boys, and we are very much interested in 50 boys being able to play another year of football. You all know if you take six boys off the freshman squad and put them on the varsity you will see motivation for the other 45 boys in very short order. For this reason we think freshman participation is good because it helps the freshman program.

Three years ago we started soccer. We put soccer in the varsity program during the second year, and gave letters as in any other sport. We had 30 out for soccer. This last year we had 27 out for freshman soccer. We played two games and we had 30 for soccer, then we had 50 playing soccer.

Especially in the College Division, this is the direction in which we should go. Our experience has been that we increase our par-

ticipation at least 25 per cent. We have 25 or maybe more boys who stay in for at least a year. A lot of them stay in the sophomore year if they aren't good enough to play in varsity athletics.

Mr. Butler: Let me ask Jim (Loveless) a question. I think you have proven my point. The NCAA isn't the organization to decide this. You decide it. If you think it is a good program for you, fine. I don't want the NCAA deciding which freshman rule we have. I don't think it is their business. I think the individual institution or the conference can make this decision and make it stick much better.

James Roberts: We find the freshman eligibility rule limits the number who can participate in many of the activities. If we had a junior varsity program wrestling instead of freshmen we would probably have a lot more battles. We have quarterly meets and have yet to have a full freshman team.

We have too few boys come out for tennis, and therefore no tennis program for the freshman. He drops out for a year and possibly we never see him again. It is the same way with golf. So the freshman rule limits the number of boys who can participate.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): I represent an institution with a 1500 enrollment. I would like to support the point just made. I think it is a serious problem. I think there are three problems—money, money and money. We want to increase participation as much as possible.

We have been fortunate to have run three freshman programs. Stan (Marshall) I differ with you. We have been privileged to have this program across the board, 20 basketball games, and we can do it. But I do subscribe to the proposition that the more boys we can have participating the better off we are in our institution, and we are happy to have a college freshman program and a junior varsity program in addition to the varsity. If the amendment does pass permitting the use of freshmen in all sports we are still going to have a freshman program, because we feel it is such a valuable asset to the students to have been exposed to intercollegiate competition.

Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): One thing we have to consider is that this figure of 1250 is an arbitrary one. In three years of operation, we have over 1250 male students, but if you cut it down to full-time students it will be under 1250, and you would eliminate an institution from competition by an arbitrary figure which does not indicate whether it means full time or part time students.

Chairman Witham: I think you only count full-time male students.

Dwight Reed (Lincoln University): The reason I advocated the 1250 figure was because it would equalize competition. That was when we just had two divisions. I can see, if we don't have the freshman rule and everybody is allowed to participate, we will have more equitable competition if we have three divisions.

I agree with the fellow who said "money, money and money is the problem." We have to win national championships and in order to win national championships we have to get on the level and the quickest way to get on a level is to have more levels on which all of us can compete. I am for three levels with freshmen competition across the board.

Mr. Marshall: I think the Springfield College program is an excellent one. I think you can also have the same thing with the junior varsity program. I differ with Jim Roberts. I came to school in 1946 and I was not one of the good freshmen that was moved up. I was left on the junior varsity and I don't recall that I showed much interest. Some of the kids who came off the junior varsity squad later played very well. I think you can do what Springfield College is now doing with the junior varsity program.

Harry Troxell (Colorado State University): The elimination of freshman participation makes it extremely difficult for the small college to operate. We have found the matter of student enrollment is not the most important consideration. You have to think in terms of how much money you have, not on male enrollment.

Now we are in the age of student protest. We will have to re-adjust and rethink our thinking, which has been based on tradition alone. Simply because we have throughout the years said that freshmen should not participate didn't necessarily mean that is right. When the students start demonstrating and telling us, "It is illegal for you to deny me the right to participate," it seems to me it is unconstitutional to tell freshmen that they cannot participate. We in the NCAA need to reexamine this and determine if it is constitutionally correct to tell a person that he cannot participate.

John Winkin (Colby College): I have been listening to this, knowing that no matter what we do at the national level and even at the regional level our faculties are going to decide pretty much what we can do. I know no matter what the NCAA does or the ECAC does, my faculty is going to tell us what we can do. In our case, no matter what the rules are, we won't be able to play freshmen because our faculty won't permit it. That doesn't say I don't believe in it, but that is what our faculty is going to do.

I somewhat agree with Lysle (Butler) and I also think the most encouraging thing to help equalize national competition is a third division. I also suggest a good solution to the problem is the NCAA Council's Amendment VI-D (page B-6).

Glenn J. Drahn (Coe College): I participated in a master study in regard to something we haven't even talked about. Education is the thing we are interested in I hope, and this study had to do with schools that played freshmen as opposed to those which did not play freshmen in football alone. It revealed whether those boys graduated and whether they continued on with the football program.

I received a very nice letter from the young man, saying we were one of the schools that had the highest rate of graduation of freshmen football players. Some schools were as low as three or four per cent and they were playing freshmen.

We could get some valid information or at least some statistics which could tell us whether this is good for the boy or not. It is one of the things that can be determined. I don't think any decision should be made on money alone; it is what is good for the student.

Delegate: We are rapidly reaching the point where we are running into some of the problems that they have in other educational areas, in the classroom, for example. None of this would under-emphasize the importance of the students we have and the program being educational. Athletic activity, whether it be football or what-

ever, is the vehicle we are using and we have to make it the best vehicle possible.

These youngsters today are much different than we were back in our college years, and that was just ten years ago. As someone pointed out, they have been around the corner a lot more times than we were before we went to college.

The studies of these young students we are getting will help us make our vehicle the best possible, make athletics best for them during the present time. It is different sociologically. We are altogether different and we ought to give direction, whether it be a change in the freshman rule or a third division, to continue to make our vehicle as effective as possible.

Chairman Witham: It was the consensus of the College Committee that we attempt to get Amendment VI-E (pages B-6 and B-7) passed on the Convention floor. In other words, eliminate the exceptions for basketball and football and make freshmen eligible across the board, in the College Division as well as the University Division.

(A "straw vote" revealed that the majority of those present favored Amendment E, pages B-6 and B-7.)

Mr. Butler: I heard that the College Committee took a position on proposed Amendment III-A (pages B-1 and B-2) to the Constitution which states in part:

"(2) A student who transfers from a collegiate institution while he is disqualified or suspended for academic or disciplinary reasons must complete two calendar years of residence at the certifying institution."

Is there going to be an amendment submitted by the College Committee or any part of the NCAA Council to delete this paragraph?

Chairman Witham: It has been suggested that we do this. The reason being that this is too much of a penalty and that some individuals are able to get around the rule by going to other institutions or junior colleges and then to a senior college. The Committee is not unanimous in its thinking on this subject.

Mr. Drahn: Does this apply to students who did not participate on athletic teams at larger institutions?

Chairman Witham: This applies to all transfer students.

The next topic is regional qualification meets for the National College Division Championships in track and field and wrestling. These Championships are getting so crowded that it is almost impossible to run a good meet.

Regional Qualification Meets

Wallace T. Johnson (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I was listening with interest to the discussion of freshman participation and hope you will forgive me for taking two or three minutes. I happen to be the freshman football coach and administrative assistant at the University of Minnesota, and I hope you would not base your voting on the freshman rule having been the same for the College and the University Divisions. Our problems are entirely separate.

I have kept statistics since 1952. We award an average, gentlemen, of 44 freshman numerals per year. At the end of this particular time, as each boy finishes his competition, we have kept 12 of those boys. Twelve have earned a varsity letter, and one has earned

a gratis award. You can see the mortality rate is quite terrific in a Big Ten University.

We feel there is a tremendous transition period for these boys. If we are going to worry about their participating at our level we are going to be in trouble. If we had freshman competition the boy would be more concerned with the competition than he would with his books, so our mortality rate would jump up.

In regard to the relationship between good grades and good athletes, I would like to make this comment: We jumped in the Big Ten from the 33 1/3 percentile in the boy's graduating class to the 51st percentile. I have statistics now for two years. Remember, I said we had 44 athletes. We still do. Twelve of them earned letters and one a gratis award. At the present time we have two classes who have finished their competition. We jumped from 12 earned letters up to 14, only a jump of two, whereas we jumped 18 percentile points in our academic basis. But we have also jumped from one gratis award to five per year. In the two years I have been able to keep statistics, we have had five boys who did not earn a letter in participation, so we are taking boys in our program and they are staying with us longer, but they are not what we call the true athletes. If we go to freshman participation I think this is going to jump.

How many gentlemen are here who have a wrestling program? [The majority] Wonderful! Statistics show that wrestling is the fastest-growing interscholastic and intercollegiate sport.

The Wrestling Rules Committee has been running the College Division Tournament for the past four years.

We are now getting to the place where we have to find an institution, regardless of whether it is the University or College Division, that is large enough and has the facilities to put eight mats on the boards. This calls for a large institution plus a lot of help in running the tournament. I think it is getting out of hand and I recommend that we have regional qualification meets. When you get over 300 boys representing 90 to 100 institutions at a national championship, it is quite unwieldy and a little difficult to administer.

The top qualifiers in the College Division Tournament may compete in the University Division tournament. Two or three boys from the College Division last year gained a national championship. I think that is good. Out of 44 boys who qualify in the College Division Championships, we usually have an average of about half of those, 20 to 22, in the National Collegiates.

One question we always have is on site selection. Rules Committee members like to visit the institution at its expense. We feel they could take this out of the gate receipts of the event. We would like to go there to check because we in the Rules Committee are criticized when facilities are not good. One of the reasons for doing this was to try to put on the best tournament possible.

Chairman Witham: The NCAA Executive Committee approved the recommendation of the College Committee that a member of the Rules Committee visit the proposed site and that the expenses of that visit come out of the proceeds of the College tournament.

W. Roy Phillips (Franklin and Marshall College): Wally, does

this mean the recommendation is to go to a regional setup for qualification?

Mr. Johnson: You understand the Rules Committee can merely recommend to the College Committee plus the Executive Committee that we have regionals?

Mr. Phillips: As a member of the Wrestling Rules and Tournament Committee, I heartily recommend this because of the tremendous size of the College Division Tournament.

Franklin and Marshall is in the position of having to choose the College Division because of our size. I wonder whether there are any other institutions who have the same problem we do. Because of the College Division tournament being held on the same day as our conference tournament we are unable to qualify for the National Championships.

Chairman Witham: Roy (Phillips), your college was the only one throughout the membership that seemed to have this conflict. When there are 190 or 200 schools who seem to be able to do this, I think the move is yours. Our recommendation was that you would have to qualify through the College Division tournament if you want to compete in the University Tournament this year.

Walter L. Hass (University of Chicago): Ted Haydon, our track coach, feels that track should be head-to-head competition; that you shouldn't have track championships by time. Ted feels the qualifying standards set up for participation in the national meet are good.

In having regional meets you have to determine an equitable number from each to qualify for the national meet. He feels it would build up tremendously throughout the country and create more opportunities to compete.

In regard to standards, there is a tendency for many of us—I have been a track coach for quite a few years—to rationalize quite a bit. If the standard is 9.6 and my boy runs 9.8 and the weather has been bad all spring, I can sit there and say, "If the weather was good he could run 9.6." By the time I talk to myself a while I convince myself he has run 9.6 and take him to the national meet.

Ted and I feel that it would be much better to have regional meets and give every boy an opportunity.

In some sections of the country they run all year around and have lots of opportunities to make the standard. In other areas you have two or three weeks. But these boys may develop by June and will be running well enough or throwing well enough to do a good job in national competition.

My recommendation, based upon Ted Haydon's ideas, is that we have regional competition and send the top men from each region to the national championship.

Dwight Reed (Lincoln University): This problem is twofold.

First, we find on the regional level that the number of schools participating in going down. In the Midwest meet there were 15 to 17 schools in the last few years. On the Pacific Coast there were 14 schools participating. When we get into the national championship we wind up with 80 schools saying they are coming. There are 53 doing the scoring. In the national meet we had 43 men running 3,000 meters. We have 40 or 50 men running 200 meters. It becomes cumbersome, because folks are fabricating their times and we have to

eliminate men which is not advisable in the first heat.

The argument has been made that if we establish regional meets on a definite date then all College Division members will know that you must qualify to go to the national. The machinery could be something like this: The national meet will be rotated every four years; all institutions will have to compete in the regional to qualify. If the region hosting the national championship does not have a regional championship, the national meet itself would be the determining factor and the institutions in that region would adhere to a minimum standard to qualify.

Robert S. Loomis (University of California, Davis): I would like to comment on the third competitive division. In reflecting on the use of the terms University Division and College Division, I think it is quite obvious to all of us that these are arbitrary names and are not related to the character or scope of the academic program. So as your Committee is studying this problem of the third competitive division, I urge you very strongly to consider renaming the whole setup.

Francis Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): It would be helpful to the Executive Committee if you have another vote on these two questions, (track and wrestling regionals).

(A straw vote revealed a majority of those present favored regional championships in track and wrestling.)

Axel C. Bundgaard (St. Olaf College): What happens when the times in a regional meet do not compare favorably with the others? If you qualify the first three and the fourth-place winner's time could have placed him second in a different region?

Mr. Reed: If we are qualifying from a regional championship it doesn't make a bit of difference. He can be first or sixth. The only athletes who would have to meet the qualifying standard would be the ones in the region where the national championship is going to be held. Those individuals would not compete on the regional level, but they would have to meet qualifying standards. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Bundgaard: Not exactly. Have you decided how many to qualify?

Mr. Reed: We have discussed this and we feel the top six should qualify which means a field of 24 in each event at the national meet.

H. Frank Leftwich (Tuskegee Institute): What is the rationale behind not having the athletes in the region in which the championship is going to be held meet the standard?

Mr. Reed: First, if you had a regional championship and a national championship in the same particular region it might detract from the national championship.

It was also felt if you had a national championship in a particular region we would get better spectator support if more of those individuals in that particular region were running and it might make for a better monetary reward.

(The session then adjourned at 11:35 a.m.)

HONORS LUNCHEON

Tuesday, January 7, 1969

The Honors Luncheon was held in the Pacific Ballroom of the Los Angeles Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles, California, and was called to order by the President of the Association, Marcus L. Plant of the University of Michigan.

President Plant: Ladies and gentlemen, this is an occasion of great joy and gratitude for the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Our Association is, of course, deeply interested in athletic prowess and performance, but that is not the entire limit of our interest. We are equally interested in intellectual and spiritual values. So we take this occasion to honor those men who in their undergraduate career have exhibited not only athletic prowess but intellectual prowess and who, after completing their undergraduate collegiate career, have exhibited accomplishment in their chosen profession.

I have the great pleasure of presenting the master of ceremonies. As a University of Wyoming undergraduate, Curt Gowdy played in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Basketball Tournament. This year he will be doing the television play-by-play of the same tournament. Curt starred in basketball at Wyoming in the early 1940's and was selected to the Rocky Mountain Conference All-Star team three years in a row. He won six letters at Wyoming, also playing baseball.

As a sportscaster he has been an all-star, too, broadcasting many of the major sports events in the world annually for NBC. He was elected the nation's top sportscaster each of the past three years by the radio and television columnists of the country.

He is a native of Wyoming and now lives in New England with his wife and three children. Last week he announced the Rose Bowl Game for us and this week serves as master of ceremonies.

It is a great pleasure to present him to you now—Curt Gowdy. [Applause.]

Toastmaster Gowdy: Thank you very much. President Plant, Honored Guests at the Head Table, and Ladies and Gentlemen: I am naturally happy to be here today. We enjoyed ourselves so much out here during the Rose Bowl week, and it is a privilege to be here today.

When I see a bunch like this I am reminded of a friend of mine who was very involved in politics. He went to one of the largest business dinners in Washington, D. C.; a big political dinner where there were about 1,500 people. My friend wangled himself into the head table. As he came in, they seated him next to a wispy little Chinese man. He sat there and tried to start a conversation and didn't get far. The Chinese gentleman gave him a blank stare, and he thought, "It looks like I'm in trouble here tonight!"

Finally they brought in the first course and served the soup, and my friend thought, "I might as well try again." He leaned over and said, "Likie soupie?"

The little Chinese stared at him.

After the dinner was over they started the ceremonies and the main speaker was Dr. Wellington Thiu, one of the greatest minds of the world, former ambassador from China. He got up and in perfect English, with perfect diction, gave one of the finest speeches ever heard in the nation's capital. He sat down and there was a standing ovation.

He leaned over to my friend and said, "Likie speechie?" [Laughter and applause.]

First of all, I would like to introduce the executive officers of the associations who do a fine job in athletics.

The President of the American Football Coaches Association; head coach of the University of Minnesota; Coach of the Year in 1960; Coach of the 1960 Big Ten Conference champions, Murray Warmath. [Applause.]

The Executive Director of the United States Track Coaches Association, now director of athletics of the University of Michigan, Mr. Don Canham. [Applause.]

President of the College Athletic Business Managers Association, from Indiana University, Mr. Frank W. Anderson. [Applause.]

President of the College Sports Information Directors of America, Mr. Tom Miller of Indiana University. [Applause.]

We have with us today one of the outstanding athletes of any year, and especially of 1968, to represent America's 35 Olympic Gold Medal winners from NCAA institutions. He thrilled the nation and the world in the most demanding test there is for a man to capture. He won the Decathlon Championship at Mexico City. He is a graduate of Colorado with an A.B. degree and is working toward a Master's Degree in Education. The Gold Medal Winner in Decathlon—Mr. Bill Toomey. [Prolonged applause.]

William Toomey: The first thing that comes to my mind is: Why wasn't I seated next to the young lady up here? [Laughter.] I am sure all the other Gold Medal Winners would have thought the same thing.

Just briefly, I can say it is a great pleasure to be invited here. As far as my feelings about Mexico City and my fellow countrymen who did so well there, I thought it was a tremendous effort, regardless of what you saw or read or heard. It was a great group of athletes.

Each four years, to win in the Olympic Games presents a more difficult problem to the United States in that every four years the other nations get stronger and faster and smarter. Sometimes we get stronger and faster, but not always smarter. However, this year we did enough, as the press said, to win the Olympics. I don't think that is entirely accurate, but we did better than the athletes thought they would do and better than the coaches expected and as well as you probably thought we would do.

We need a lot of help. I say "we" although I guess I am finished, but I feel very much a part of the Olympic idea and the Olympic spirit. I feel my ability to talk to you today and inspire you to think more about amateur athletics. The professionals don't need any more

benefits. We need the benefits. Four years from now we will have a representative group, because this is the platform upon which America stands in front of the other nations of the world and it is one of the proudest and most honorable feelings I have ever had, to be a part of the U. S. Olympic Team.

I hope four years from now we can have a team that will be as representative of the finest country in the world as we were in 1968. I hope we will have the support of all the major institutions of the United States.

I would like to say the athletes of this country who represent you do it at zero cost, and you should always take that into consideration. These people are doing it because they love it.

Once again, we would like to say to you who helped us in 1968; thank you very much.

Toastmaster Gowdy: I am sure most of you know that in 1968 college football again broke all attendance records and many other records. This coming year is the one-hundredth anniversary of college football.

We have been blessed with a beautiful and intelligent young Queen to reign over the Centennial, a sophomore at Texas Tech, a lovely representative of the Southwest Conference.

She had an amazing 3.9 grade point average in government, in which she plans a career. She was a majorette at Texas Tech and a member of Phi Delta Sorority. Her father is a brigadier general, retired, and she is from New Braunfels, Texas.

Here, ladies and gentlemen, is College Football's Centennial Queen, Miss Barbara Specht. [Applause.]

Miss Barbara Specht: Thank you very much, Mr. Gowdy. It is a great pleasure for me to be here today and it has certainly been a most enjoyable experience to meet the many people I have met here. Even more than that, it is a great honor for me to represent college football in this one-hundredth year of its existence. I am grateful to the NCAA for this experience, and I am grateful for the scholarship which they have awarded me which will help to continue my education at Texas Tech.

I can't tell you how much I am looking forward to the Centennial Year of College Football this coming year, and I know that the color and excitement which is college football will be true this year as it has been in the past. Thank you. [Applause.]

Toastmaster Gowdy: I was over at Burbank yesterday, and when I came out of the parking lot the shabbiest looking man you ever saw came up. What a bum! He said, "Can you give me a couple of bucks?"

I said, "Look at you. You have to be a rummy. I will give you a couple of bucks and you can go buy a bottle of cheap rum and go on a bat."

He said, "On my mother's grave, I would swear to you if I had a Bible, I don't drink and I don't smoke and I don't mess around with women."

I said, "Get into my car."

He said, "What do you want? Where are we going?"

I told him, "I want to take you back to my hotel. I want to show my wife what happens to a guy like that." [Laughter.]

To recognize the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship winners here with us today and to present the award-winning student-athletes, is a man who was President of NCAA in 1964 when the program was initiated, the dean of the division of extension and university services at the University of Iowa, member of the NCAA Executive Committee, Robert F. Ray.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. Gowdy, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: These honors are becoming a part of our tradition as the National Collegiate Athletic Association. In the past, we have honored leaders in business and government and in space exploration, and all of those who have been honored in the past have demonstrated great achievement in their lives; and in all of their lives, intercollegiate athletics has played an important role.

Today we have a number of young men who represent those who received \$1000 NCAA Postgraduate Scholarships. In presenting these awards annually the NCAA is proud that it is not only honoring today but building for tomorrow, and I am confident after looking at the collegiate record of these young men that many of these student-athletes will be among our leaders tomorrow.

Since the program was initiated in 1964, the NCAA has awarded 256 scholarships for professional postgraduate work. Thus the Association has made a very substantial investment in the future, not only in the future of the lives of these young men but in the future of our country.

The program has grown from 32 awards in the first year to 80 such awards made during this current academic year.

There are three representatives of the 1968 crop of scholarship winners here at the head table and representatives of that and other years are seated on the ballroom floor. I would like to introduce those who are here with us today.

First of all, Robert Edward Armstrong, who attended UCLA as an undergraduate student and is continuing his education at Denison.

William Victor Backensto, University of Toledo, who received his award in 1967 for basketball; now at UCLA pursuing advance work in physics.

William Dale Creighton, California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo; a 1969 football winner.

Dallas Edd Grider, UCLA, 1968, now at UCLA doing advanced work in Geography.

John Roger St. John, Occidental College; a 1968 football winner.

Richard Allen Stillinger, Occidental; a 1968 award winner in the sport of swimming, now at UCLA seeking a degree in medicine.

Richard Reed Swan, Stanford University; 1967 award winner whose sport was baseball, now at UCLA doing advance work in business administration.

Phillip Evans Tuckett, Weber State College; 1968 football college division winner, now at San Diego State College doing advance work in English.

Richard Ladd Starbuck, Norwich University; 1967 football winner, now at UCLA in business administration, [Applause.]

Now it is my pleasure to present to you Mr. Steve Sogge. Mr. Sogge has been on the football and baseball teams of the University

of Southern California for three years and has been in the top ten per cent of his class. He was named All-Pacific-8 Conference quarterback for 1968 and All-America. He quarterbacked the Trojans in two Rose Bowl Games and during their national championship season in 1967. He is here today representing the 1967 football players award winners. [Applause.]

Now, I would like to present Mr. Charles Brian Crouse. Mr. Crouse received a scholarship last spring after an outstanding career, which was interrupted in 1967 by serious injury. He finished fifth in the NCAA College Division pole vault as a sophomore, but suffered a broken back that summer and was ordered by his doctor to stop playing, but unwilling to abandon his sport, he last year was one of the scholarship winners. He played for six semesters with Case Institute of Technology, and now is at the California Institute of Technology working for his Master's Degree. Mr. Crouse represents the award winners of the spring of 1968. [Applause.]

Now I would like to present to you Mr. Keith Patrick Neill. Mr. Neill was a baseball player at Hiram College, and graduated first in his class last June. He is now enrolled at the University of Southern California School of Law on award scholarship. He was second baseman in the All-Ohio Conference second team last year, despite what he called a lousy year. Mr. Neill represents the award winners of the spring of 1968, and now will respond on behalf of all the 1968 scholarship winners. [Applause.]

Keith Patrick Neill: I just want to briefly thank the National Collegiate Athletic Association on behalf of all the NCAA scholarship winners. We are all sincerely thankful for such recognition and financial support, especially since it comes from the athletic community which has already given us so much. Our scholarships come as a token of the excellent and invaluable relationship with the NCAA and college athletics in general. To be so rewarded for activities which have meant so much simply for their own sake to each of us makes us truly grateful.

We thank you for the honor, for your support and for the values we have found in intercollegiate athletics. [Applause.]

Toastmaster Gowdy: Now we are going to honor outstanding performers, members of the entertainment industry who have participated in the NCAA program and earned letters during their college days.

It is always a source of embarrassment when you are being honored and you have to listen to a lot of speeches.

The greatest acceptance speech I ever heard in behalf of an honor was one given by Yogi Berra. You have heard a lot of stories about him, but this is true.

I joined the New York Yankees in 1949 as a young assistant to Mel Allen. Half way through the season, Yogi came up to our hotel and said, "They are going to give me a big night out at St. Louis. I have got to have an acceptance speech."

Mel wrote him a beautiful speech about five minutes long. It took him three months to learn it. While he was learning it he had it pinned up in the locker room. Yogi is supposed to be dumb. He has been made vice-president of three major organizations, but when he opens his mouth he puts his foot in it.

The big day arrived and we went to St. Louis to play the Browns. There was a tremendous crowd, about 25,000. This was a terrible day for the Browns. Yogi went to rehearse his acceptance speech and then he came up and stood there, and Mel said, "Yogi, go out on the ball park and give that speech."

He went out there and the stands were full. He stood behind home plate and they gave him the usual gift, a television set. I never could understand that. Ballplayers make a lot of money. They turned the lights out and put the spotlight on home plate, and Bud Young said, "Now, ladies and gentlemen, here he is, St. Louis' own Yogi Berra." Yogi waddled up to home plate and opened his mouth, and forgot his speech. He turned around to us. We were rooting for him and mentally urging him on. Then he turned back again and said, "I just want to thank everybody for making this night necessary." [Laughter.]

Presenting the awards to the honorees seated at the lower table will be Ernest B. McCoy, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer from Penn State University.

The first man couldn't be here, Max Baer, Jr., who is an actor in "The Beverly Hillbillies." He attended the University of Santa Clara and got his letter in boxing. I want to introduce Santa Clara's director of athletics, Mr. George P. Malley.

Johnny Mack Brown, actor, who majored in business administration. He excelled in football at the University of Alabama. [Applause.] Johnny Mack Brown was one of the early long-time motion picture heroes, starring in Hollywood westerns for two decades.

Born in Dothan, Alabama, Brown went to the University of Alabama. He was the backfield star of Alabama's and Wallace Wade's first Rose Bowl team, which defeated Washington 20-19 on January 1, 1926. He was an All-Southern halfback in 1924-25. Brown was elected to the National Football Hall of Fame in 1957. [Applause.]

Actor, singer and star of "Bonanza," David Canary attended the University of Cincinnati where he was music major and star football end. He studied music at the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music simultaneously with his university vocal training to further develop his lyric baritone voice.

He excelled on the football field as an end and in the classroom. He made the Academic All-America team in 1960. [Applause.]

George Smith, director of athletics at the University of Cincinnati, is representing that institution.

Mike Frankovich as an undergraduate at UCLA was a three-year football letterman, star quarterback and captain of the 1934 baseball team. He was chairman of the men's athletic board on the student council and became the first man to receive the UCLA Bruin Luncheon Club Perpetual Trophy. He was nominated by UCLA for the 1959 sports Illustrated Silver Anniversary All-America team.

Frankovich entered show business as a child actor and had an amazing career. In 1964, he became Columbia production head, based at the studio in Hollywood with world-wide responsibility for all Columbia production activity. In 1968, he announced the formation of his own production company. Representing his institution is the athletic director of the University of California at Los Angeles, J. D. Morgan. [Applause.]

Our next honoree attended the University of Syracuse, and lettered in water polo and swimming. Sheldon Leonard, graduating in 1929 from Syracuse, reached the business world just in time for the depression, so he tried show business. From 1939 to 1951 in Hollywood he appeared in featured roles in approximately 140 pictures.

He joined "The Danny Thomas Show" in its first year, 1953, as director, and has been with it ever since. Recently he became executive producer and co-owner with Thomas of T&L Productions. It owns "The Danny Thomas Show," "The Andy Griffith Show," "The Dick Van Dyke Show," "The Joey Bishop Show" and others. Not a bad lineup.

He is also executive producer of "Gomer Pyle, USMC" and created "I Spy" and "My Friend Tony." He has received seven nominations and three Emmy Awards for direction from the Television Academy.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Sheldon Leonard, and Mr. James Decker of Syracuse University. [Applause.]

Here is a man after my own heart; he played basketball at San Diego State College, 1934. Art Linkletter begins his thirty-sixth year as an entertainer in 1969 as one of the most popular and most honored individuals in the business. He is recognized as a great talent, noted humanitarian and eminently successful businessman.

Born in Canada, he went to school in San Diego and attended San Diego State College, where he was an all-conference basketball center and majored in English and education.

I wish I had him as a business adviser, but he is a terrific fellow. Look at him, still young and vigorous and a great guy. Art Linkletter. Albert Olsen, athletic director, represents San Diego State. [Applause.]

Ron Miller, executive producer of Walt Disney Productions won All-America mention at the University of Southern California, graduating in 1954. Miller participated in the 1953 Rose Bowl game in which the Trojans beat Wisconsin 7-0.

A stretch in the Army and a year in pro football later, Miller joined Walt Disney studios in 1957. Beginning as a second assistant director, he moved up to associate producer and on to his present double capacity as executive producer of Walt Disney Productions and vice-president of television. He has served as executive producer of "Walt Disney's Wonderful World of Color" and produced TV shows and motion pictures as well.

He is an avid outdoorsman and told me he bought a ranch in Montana. [Applause.]

Now from "The Big Valley," a football star at Eastern Kentucky University of 1963, Lee Majors.

A graduate of the School of Education, he was qualified to be a teacher. He worked as a playground supervisor while waiting for his acting break.

He had never ridden a horse. He not only bought one to practice riding, but soon was taking bulldogging and calf roping lessons. He does all his own riding, and as many of his stunts as allowed. A singer and guitar player, he is on the verge of a recording career. He was born in a Detroit suburb, was raised in Kentucky, and now lives on a ranch overlooking the Pacific Ocean.

From the show, "The Big Valley," from Eastern Kentucky Uni-

versity, a football star, Mr. Lee Majors. [Applause.] He just walked out of the studio.

Lee Majors: I apologize for my appearance, but we were filming and I wanted to come, so I really had to break away. [Showing his wrists handcuffed.] [Laughter and applause.]

Toastmaser Gowdy: Glenn E. Presnell, director of athletics, represents Eastern Kentucky University.

You have all watched this next honoree over the years and enjoyed him so much; singer, actor, Dennis Morgan of Carroll (Wis.) College, whose sports are football and baseball. He has had his own TV series.

Born in Wisconsin, he played tackle on the Carroll football team. Interested in drama, he appeared in most of the major dramatic productions at the school and soloed with the glee club on tours around the state. After several roles in movies, Warner Brothers offered him the role of the Red Shadow in the musical "Desert Song" and he was really launched as a star. Dennis Morgan appeared in forty Warner pictures; such musicals as "My Wild Irish Rose," "Shine On Harvest Moon," and "Two Guys from Milwaukee," and played dramatic roles in "God Is My Co-Pilot" and "Christmas in Connecticut."

Recently he has starred in the television series, "21 Beacon Street." [Applause.]

Representing his institution is one of Carroll's most distinguished alumni, whose father was president of Carroll when Dennis Morgan was a student there, a past dean, resident and student, Arthur B. Gamble.

Ozzie Nelson is a producer, director, writer, husband, father of a great family. He played football at Rutgers University, 1927. He is best known, of course, for "The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet," which he created, produced, directed, wrote and in which he co-starred. It enjoyed the longest run of any show of its kind in broadcasting history, from 1944 to 1966.

His most recent acting role is in MGM's "The Impossible Years," which has not yet been released. He and his wife co-starred in a stage production of the show at The Drury Lane Theater in Chicago for two months this fall.

When he attended Rutgers University, Ozzie Nelson excelled in football, lacrosse and swimming. He starred as quarterback for three years. He also won a college boxing championship as a middleweight, was captain of the debating team and was elected to Cap and Skull, the senior honorary society.

Harriet Hilliard joined the band in 1932 as a featured vocalist. They were married in 1935. After being featured on several radio series, the Nelsons started their own show, "The Adventures of Ozzie and Harriet."

The institutional representative of Rutgers University is its director of athletics, Albert Twitchell. [Applause.]

The next man is a great singer, actor, vigorous, handsome and my wife's idol, the dirty rat. Of the University of Redlands, 1939, John Raitt lettered for three years in football and track and field. He was unbeaten in the javelin throw, shot put and discus throw. He was hopeful of going to the Olympics in 1940, but World War II ended

that dream.

John Raitt's first professional singing engagement was in the Los Angeles Civic Light Opera production of "H.M.S. Pinafore."

Of course, he reached great stardom in "Oklahoma." It was in this Rodgers and Hammerstein musical that he attained initial Broadway acclaim and awards for the best performance of that year. After two years with the show, he starred in three others, then had another hit, "The Pajama Game," which he did on Broadway for 1000 performances. He subsequently made a movie of the show.

John Raitt is about to open a new musical, "Many Happy Returns," in Las Vegas. Representing his institution is the director of athletics at Redlands, Mr. Ted Runner. [Applause.]

[President Plant presented the plaques to the remainder of the honorees.]

As an All-America football player at Stanford, Bob Reynolds was a gridiron legend at age twenty-two by virtue of having played sixty minutes in three consecutive Rose Bowl games—an unmatched feat. He is a member of the National Football Foundation's Hall of Fame.

He played on the famous Stanford football team which vowed it would never be beaten by SMU in the Rose Bowl.

After a brief career in professional football, he joined the sales force of radio station KMPC, Los Angeles, in 1938 as sales manager, and later became general manager of the station.

In the 1940's, Reynolds met Gene Autry and they formed Golden West Broadcasters, and everyone on the West Coast knows that story. They also purchased the California Angels Baseball Club, and Bob Reynolds now is president of the California Angels Baseball Club. He is also on a four-man committee, the Television Committee, of the major league baseball clubs, and has played a very important part in the functioning of major league baseball. The institutional representative today of Stanford is Chuck Taylor, athletic director. [Applause.]

You know, that was quite a football team, and I would like to introduce a teammate of Bob's. I don't know where he is in the audience. He played fullback on that team, and he is on the Board of Directors of the California Angels; Mr. Bob Campbell. [Applause.]

Well, we are going to load the film up again and we will be right with you and continue our honors. You know, these camera changes and the reruns now in slow motion and stop action and the gimmicks we now use I think really widen the interest in football and all our sports.

I remember back in my early days when I was broadcasting for the Boston Red Sox, we used to cover with three cameras, but then they came up with the zoom lens, like a slide trombone, bringing it close up.

We were playing a game in the Philadelphia park with the Philadelphia Athletics, and we were proud of the lens, which was the first we had in Boston. I was going to get very cute on the air with it. Philadelphia had a manager named Jimmy Dykes, one of baseball's most colorful men. He was coaching at third base. Eddie Joost was the batter. I said, "We have our new lens here today"—and Dykes was giving some signs—"let's see if we can pick up the

signs from third-base coach Dykes."

Up comes the sign [Gesturing], here comes the pitch, and down comes the ball. I said, "Ladies and gentlemen, that must have been the take sign. Joost let it go by."

"Let's get back on Jimmy Dykes at third base. Come on, Eddie, watch it up there now." [Gesturing] Back it comes. He swings and misses. I said, "He gave him the hit sign."

"But now with a runner on first and one out, we are coming to the most important sign of the game. Is it going to be a bunt, a hit and run, a steal? Let's get to Jimmy Dykes and watch with our lens."

And just as we got the big lens up, he leaned way over and started to scratch his fanny. I mean, he was really digging down. He hadn't even straightened up, and they had about 10,000 fans in the ball park. And they accused me of being smutty.

The game was over and I was in the locker room. I said, "That was a great sign you gave with thousands of people watching."

He took his tobacco out of his mouth and said, "You keep those damned television cameras out of here, for when Mother Nature calls I am going to respond," and he did. [Laughter.]

Now, a producer from 20th Century Fox Studios, Aaron Rosenberg; one of the greatest names on the West Coast in football. He made the Los Angeles All-City team four straight years in high school, then was an All-America selection in 1932 and 1933 as a tackle for Southern California.

He started at Hollywood in the studios in the summer doing odd jobs. After serving four wartime years in the Navy he returned to directing. Next he was an associate producer, and in 1949 he became a full-fledged producer. His 1949 arrangement for "Winchester 73" with James Stewart, whereby the star deferred a major part of his regular fee for 50 per cent participation, changed the economic format of the motion picture industry.

In 1958 he formed his own company, Arcola Pictures, at MGM. He produced several pictures there, including "Mutiny on the Bounty," before moving Arcola to 20th Century Fox in 1962. Since that time his productions have included "Move Over Darling," "Caprice," "Tony Rome" and "The Detective."

The faculty representative of the University of Southern California, William C. Himstreet, is here representing the institution. [Applause.]

I don't believe the next honoree is present. Tom Smothers, San Jose State College, 1960, lettered in gymnastics. Mr. Bob Bronzan, San Jose athletic director, will see that Tommy Smothers receives his plaque.

Robert Stack is ill with the flu today. University of Southern California, Polo. I have done a couple of shows on American sports with him. He really has a story. He was American skeet champion when he was only sixteen years old. He is not here today, but Jesse Hill, director of athletics of Southern California will accept the plaque in his honor.

Next is a star in both television and motion pictures. Woody Strode played end on the 1937, 1938 and 1939 UCLA football teams. He was All-Pacific Coast in 1939, and held the UCLA shot put and discus records. He then became a professional wrestler and football

player.

When he started acting in movies his first job was as a stunt man, and one of his most spectacular stunts was diving off the top deck of a Mississippi River Boat in "The Gambler From Natchez."

His acting break finally came in the movie "Pork Chop Hill." Strode then abandoned his muscles for career purposes and became an actor in earnest.

Among other appearances, Strode has played prominent roles in "The Long Voyage," "Two Rode Together," "The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance," "The Professionals," and his latest film, "Shalako." I just saw him on the airplane in "Shalako."

Born in Los Angeles, Woody Strode has lived there since, and now resides in East Los Angeles.

The UCLA assistant director of athletics, Robert Fisher, is here representing the institution. [Applause.]

From the University of Oklahoma, a track and field star there in 1948; right now he is the star of television's "Gentle Ben." Dennis Weaver was a top-flight football and track athlete in high school and then went on to win college honors at the University of Oklahoma in the latter sport. In 1948, he placed sixth in the United States Olympic decathlon tryouts.

His combination of athletic and dramatic activities earned him the title of Oklahoma's Most Versatile Man.

Of course, you all remember Chester of "Gunsmoke," one of the greatest personalities ever on television, for which he won an Emmy Award in 1960.

An exceptionally hard worker, Weaver uses what time he has free from television productions to appear in theatrical roles. He is also active in television dramatic roles.

A native of Joplin, Missouri, Dennis Weaver now lives in Encino. He and his wife are so active in community affairs that they were named Encino's "Family of the Year, for their outstanding moral, social and civic leadership."

The institutional representative is Oklahoma's faculty representative, Professor David Swank, a member of the NCAA Council. [Applause.]

Now, to respond in behalf of the executives, the men behind the scenes of the cameras, Mr. Sheldon Leonard. [Applause.]

Sheldon Leonard: In behalf of myself and my colleagues who are behind the cameras—Aaron Rosenberg, Mike Frankovich and Ron Miller—permit me to express our thanks for the honor you have conferred upon us.

Our collegiate athletic background has been an obvious advantage. Our profession more than any others depends upon a combination of athletics. We are required to have a knowledge of the public tastes that comes only after years of bruising experiences with audiences, and yet we must retain the stamina of youth in order to persevere in the endless battle. I am sure I speak for my colleagues as well as myself in saying that only by continuing with modified forms of training materials and procedures we learned in our athletic careers are we able to meet the physical demands of our profession. Without that training our contribution would suffer immeasurably and there is little doubt we would be crushed under the charge of the young

people who are endlessly snapping at our heels with teeth gleaming through bearded lips. [Applause.]

We assure you, while we may not be able to outtalk the articulate, energetic young people, we can probably outwrestle them. [Laughter and applause.]

Toastmaster Gowdy: To respond in behalf of the performers before the cameras and the microphones, Mr. Ozzie Nelson. [Applause.]

Ozzie Nelson: Thank you very much. I am going to make this very brief because I know the hour is getting late and the program is a little long, and we all want to get back to work. Besides, they just gave me a note that said, "Hold it down to two minutes," so I can clear my throat for a minute and a half.

I don't want to belabor the point, but I spoke at a luncheon last year for the AAU and they allowed me twenty-five minutes. [Laughter.]

I want to say that I feel doubly honored here today, first of all, because I can receive one of these plaques for records in sports, and also because I was the one who was called upon to answer for the other actors.

They had to make out two awards for me. The guy who makes out the names had the first one made out to "Ozzie and Harriet." This will be the first award I have received in twenty years that does not have Harriet's name on it, but I am getting used to that.

As I came through the lobby an old boy came up to me and said, "Hey, I know you! You're Ozzie and Harriet." [Laughter.]

This has been a very big week for Rutgers. As you know, it is the Centennial of the first football game played between Rutgers and Princeton one hundred years ago. And while we are on the subject, I would like to deny the rumor that Art Linkletter is spreading, that I played in that game. [Laughter.] I didn't come to Rutgers until ten or fifteen years after that. [Laughter.]

But I do want to take this opportunity to congratulate you and your fine organization for the wonderful job that you have been doing in behalf of the young people throughout the years. I don't think there is anything I can say here about the advantages of intercollegiate athletics that you have not heard many, many times, but I do want to say that all of us here have at least one thing in common, and that is that we have all known the glories of victory and the agonies of defeat, but more important than that, we have all known the joy of participating, of taking part, and after all I think that is the most important. I think that is one of the most important things that athletics is all about.

So in behalf of all the actors, I want to thank you so much for not only giving us these fine awards but for allowing us to participate once again, for allowing us to play a small part in the fine big scene of intercollegiate athletics. [Applause.]

Toastmaster Gowdy: While running down the list of honorees, I forgot to introduce one man, one of the greatest football coaches in the history of college football, Mr. Paul Bryant, athletic director of the University of Alabama. [Applause.]

Now we are going to have President Plant salute the winner of the Theodore Roosevelt Award.

[President Plant resumed the chair.]

President Plant: Before I proceed to do that, there is one sidelight on the events I thought you might be interested to hear about. When Bill Toomey was up here, you recall he said he wondered about the arrangements, that is, why he was not seated next to this lovely young lady. When he said that, she leaned over to me and said, "You know, I was sort of wondering about that, too." [Laughter.]

The Theodore Roosevelt Award is presented annually by the National Collegiate Athletic Association to a prominent American for whom competitive athletics in college and attention to physical well being thereafter have been important factors in a distinguished career of national significance and achievement.

When I started to plan for this occasion, I wanted to memorize Justice Byron White's record, but I abandoned that plan because it is too long. I am going to read it.

A legendary football player at the University of Colorado, Byron White was an All-American halfback in 1937, leading his team to an undefeated season and to a contest in the Cotton Bowl. He was second in the balloting for the Heisman Trophy. White was a three-year starter in football at Colorado, but he also starred in baseball and basketball being named to all-conference teams in both of those sports.

Justice White was and still is a dedicated scholar. A story from the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE tells that Byron White was studying calculus while reclining on the rubbing table between halves of a football game.

He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa at Colorado and was the recipient of a Rhodes Scholarship.

He played professional football before and after his postgraduate work at Oxford, and was named to the National Football League all-star team.

He studied law at Yale during his second year as a professional.

During World War II, Byron White served in the Navy in the Pacific War Zone. He returned to Yale Law School, following the war and graduated as first man in the class of 1948. He served as a law clerk to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, then returned to Denver, where he was active in many civic projects and was an outstanding corporation lawyer.

He was named a Deputy Attorney General of the United States in 1961 and was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States in 1962.

He is a member of the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame, and he was the recipient of the Foundation's Gold Medal Award in 1962.

As the winner of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, he joins two other eminent Americans—Dwight D. Eisenhower and Leverett Saltonstall. Justice White! [Applause.]

The Honorable Byron White: President Plant, Mr. Gowdy, Honored Guests, Members and Friends of the National Athletic Association: As you know, the Association has somehow for several years found it possible to squeeze into its busy schedule a suitable event designed to honor not only the current generation of college athletes but also the athletes of the past and some past performances.

The world is enhanced by these athletes and enhanced by this

wonderful group of young people, these young athletes of 1968-69, like Bill Toomey and all his fellow athletes who are so exciting and so impressive. So exciting and impressive that I am sure it is obvious to all of us that they will play a major role in history all the rest of their lives.

It is enhanced also by the spotlight on the performing arts and on those people in that industry who have played in college athletics and whose past performances can no more be forgotten than their present major contributions to it. I am very honored to be here with them.

And lastly, of course, there is the Theodore Roosevelt Award, which as I understand is presented to one person who is selected to represent all those past players and performers to whom college athletics has meant so much.

President Plant, I am very honored to accept the award on my own and on their behalf.

I should also acknowledge my thanks to the University of Colorado, to its officials, to its coaches, and all my fellow players, at this luncheon.

I should also like to acknowledge the presence in the audience of Mr. Harry Carroll, who may be known to some of you senior statesmen of the Association. He was a great coach at the University of Colorado in my day, and was later made athletic director.

He is a master coach and because of him I sometimes spend two or three days in the field in the fall, as I am sure Curt Gowdy would like to do sometimes, especially at Platte River.

I suppose it is quite natural and fitting for the Association to be proud of the past and to learn something from its history. The Association has long been known as a modern, on-going institution, and the problems which confront it, like the problems which face all modern institutions, are very difficult and complex and there are imponderable choices which challenge the best minds of the country. I am sure only the greatest amount of skill and energy can hope to even cope with some of these issues.

What is more important, I think everyone will admit that the business of college football is public business, and it is very visible public business, and in this context I think the role of the Association is quite clear. Because of the way it is organized and the way it operates it has accumulated an enormous amount of skill and experience in these endeavors and must bring all of its counsel to bear in its operation.

More than that, I think the Association must, as it has in the past, not conduct its affairs as a representative of any narrow interest group, but it must conduct them as the discharge of a public trust, which I am sure it will do.

Ladies and gentlemen, some of us do feel grateful to have played some small part in the affairs of the Association in the past, small and perhaps indirect. We are grateful for your guiding hand. We never felt that hand as much as we have today. Thank you.

President Plant: It is now my pleasure to introduce the recipient of the institutional plaque which accompanies the Theodore Roosevelt Award, and it will be received by William H. Baughn, dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration and the School of

Business at the University of Colorado and the faculty representative of the University of Colorado. Mr. Baughn! [Applause.]

William H. Baughn: Mr. Plant, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a real pleasure for me to accept this on behalf of the University of Colorado and to express the University's appreciation to the NCAA for the honor it has bestowed upon one of the University's most distinguished graduates. It is a privilege for the University to be able to share this occasion with Justice White. [Applause.]

Toastmaster Gowdy: I just want to say I am a walking encyclopedia on Justice White. He was my idol in high school. "Whizzer" White is one of the greatest nicknames I ever heard. I don't think many of you know he played with the last-place Pittsburgh Steelers and the next-to-the-last-place Detroit Lions and led the National Football League in ground gaining. I saw him kick the greatest punt I ever saw, 87 yards, against the University of Wyoming. It is still a record punt for the University of Colorado and maybe the nation.

The late President Kennedy described Justice White with one statement: "Everything that Byron White has attempted he has done with the highest degree of competence." I don't think there is a man in the history of college athletics who has ever been as excellent in everything he did as Justice White. I am proud to be sitting at the table with him today. [Applause.]

I have really enjoyed being your master of ceremonies and having the thrill of introducing so many greats in the entertainment business. I am looking forward to telecasting the NCAA Basketball Championship in March over NBC television. It is a great package and it is getting bigger by the year, and you can be very proud of it.

President Plant: Ladies and gentlemen, as this pleasant occasion is brought to a close, we have one athlete in the room who has not received a plaque, and I want to assure you that the Arrangements Committee thought of it, and I will now repair that oversight.

Curt, may I present to you a plaque? [A plaque was presented to Mr. Gowdy.] [Applause.]

Toastmaster Gowdy: I wonder if there is anybody here from the University of Wyoming in the audience? Is "Red" Jacoby here? There is a representative. [Applause.]

The Reverend Donn D. Moomaw: Let us pray.

Grateful we are, O God, that Thou hast permitted us to be together in this kind of function. We thank you for all these who have made it possible. We thank you, O Father, for these Thou art using so effectively to build men in strong character and life. Lord, may we know that making a success of life is more important than the success we are in life.

We pray, O God, that we may follow the dictates of that one who said, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world," the world of victories, the world of acclaim, "and lose his own soul."

Help us, O God, to find ourselves, and as we find ourselves in Thee to do what we can to build the physical and spiritual and intellectual capacities of men to their highest.

Now, we make our prayer in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

(Following the benediction, the luncheon adjourned.)

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Morning, January 8, 1969

The Business Session convened at nine o'clock; Marcus L. Plant, of the University of Michigan and President of the Association, presiding.

President Plant: On Monday, the voting delegates received a copy of "Annual Reports, 1967-68," containing reports of the district Vice-Presidents and reports of the Rules and Tournament Committees. You have now had an opportunity to examine those reports, and so that the record may be clear, the Chair solicits a motion that the reports of the vice-presidents be received and approved.

(The motion was made, seconded, put to vote and carried that the reports be approved.)

9. REPORT OF THE TELEVISION COMMITTEE

William J. Flynn (Boston College): All delegates have received the NCAA Television Committee report for 1968.

Predecessor Television Committees have cautioned the Association against allowing its television policies to become stagnated. These Committees have urged that pace be kept with the growth of the television medium, and that the organization's television operations be nurtured in similar growth and expansion.

In 1968, the present television Committee made liberalizing adjustments, to a greater degree than had been done in previous years, in the rules governing the NCAA's supervision of football telecasting. The objective of these revisions was to gain improved promotion of college football and increased benefits therefrom. It is the conviction of this Committee that the record reflected in the foregoing report establishes the fact that these gains for football in general have been accomplished without damage to individual football-playing colleges and their competitive programs.

Accordingly, the Committee now recommends that the Association consent to its consideration and possible adoption of further liberalizations which might similarly improve the television series without introducing harmful influences. The success of last autumn's night telecasts, which created opposition to minimum numbers of regularly scheduled games suggests the desirability of some additional use of the night telecasts. For example, consideration might well be given to a night presentation on the opening date in the telecast schedule and another on the October Saturday when major league baseball will be playing back-to-back games in its two new intra-league playoffs.

The Committee feels that future television Committees must remain alert to any and all possibilities for television to be of service to NCAA football.

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of this report.
(The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.)

10. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Amateurism

James R. McCoy (Ohio State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I would like to present an amendment to Article 3, Section 1 of the Constitution, Principle of Amateurism, to insert as follows: "or has entered into an agreement of any kind to compete in professional athletics or to negotiate a professional sports contract." (See Amendment I-A, page B-1)

This material has already been approved in its interpretation, and the purpose of this action is to incorporate it into the Constitution.

Mr. President, I move its adoption.

(The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried without dissent.)

Educational Objective of Intercollegiate Athletics

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move that the paragraph in Section 9 of the NCAA Constitution, be lettered (a) and a new paragraph be entered as (b), which shall read as follows:

"(b) Member institutions shall not schedule intercollegiate athletic contests in conjunction with professional sports contests or exhibitions."

As you will note, for ten years we have tried to demarcate between professional athletics and intercollegiate sports, and this is simply to make more emphatic that line of demarcation.

Mr. President, I move this amendment be adopted. (The motion was seconded.)

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): My college will have to play in New York this year on February 15. We are located where we feel we have a clear line of demarcation from professional sports, but I believe the basketball coach felt it was a great chance for exposure for our students to go into New York. Coming from the College Division, it doesn't happen often that one of our schools plays in Madison Square Garden. I don't feel he was violating the previous amendment that was adopted in 1959.

Mr. Turner: There would be no question that if this were adopted that would not be possible. The point of course is that we are trying to tell the public there is a difference between professional and intercollegiate athletics and they should be kept as two separate activities with separate purpose.

Mr. Henry: What would be the effect of this legislation since we have already agreed to participate on February 15?

Mr. Turner: Normally speaking, the effective date would be the date it was passed. Whether or not it would concern the previously committed contract I cannot answer.

President Plant: I have spoken with the Parliamentarian on the previously existing contract and his response is that carrying out such a contract would be treated as a technical violation, but would be ignored from the standpoint of penalty. If there are previously existing contracts they can be carried out, assuming there is no chance to adjust it.

Thomas J. Niland, Jr. (LeMoyne College): Every year we seem to be surrendering more of our rights. I believe this is a matter for each institution to decide, that they have the right within themselves to make these decisions, and there is no reason why an institution should turn over this particular right to the NCAA. If our institution wishes to play, that would be our decision.

(The proposed amendment was passed, 167-55. See Amendment II-A, page B-1.)

Freshman Rule

President Plant: The Council desires to withdraw its support of Amendment III-A (pages B-1 and B-2) and will not present a motion for its adoption. Hearing no objection, the amendment shall be withdrawn.

James H. Decker (Syracuse University): Mr. President, since the 1968 Convention in New York City there has been a history of this type of legislation and the membership at yesterday's caucus deemed it advisable that an explanation be given to the Convention at this time, and with your permission I will read the statement.

Amendment IV-B (pages B-3 and B-4) is designed to undo the Association's actions of one year ago by restoring to Bylaw Article 4, Sections 1 and 2, the prohibition upon freshman participation on varsity teams. This proposal is presented by the Big Ten, the Pacific-8 and the Eastern College Athletic Conferences.

Such co-sponsorship by the ECAC was authorized in good faith by the Conference's Executive Council at its spring meeting. This action was taken in confident belief that it was in accord with the wishes of a large majority of the membership, since there had been strong opposition within the ECAC to the legislation of January, 1968, which opened NCAA championship competition to freshmen in all sports except football and basketball, and disappointment within the Conference when this legislation was adopted.

However, during the past five or six months there has been a discernible shift in opinion among ECAC constituents on the subject of freshman participation in varsity athletics. In late summer a survey conducted throughout the ECAC membership by the Metropolitan (New York) Colleges Athletic Directors Association showed enough support for such freshmen eligibility to warrant filing by an interested member college of a proposal to amend ECAC rules to permit use of freshmen on all varsity teams in sports other than football and basketball during regular season play. At the annual meeting of the ECAC on December 13 last this proposition was supported by a majority of those delegates voting, but failed to achieve the two-thirds majority needed for passage. The vote was 76 to 59. Thus there is definite evidence on record of the fact that at least 40 per cent and probably more of the ECAC's entire 187 member colleges favor making freshmen eligible. At the same meeting, the Conference voted for revised rules allowing its members to use freshmen in NCAA championship competition as long as the pertinent NCAA rules continue to be as they are at present.

Thus the situation with respect to Amendment B is this. Many ECAC member colleges favor its adoption; many others favor its defeat. This split does not reflect lack of harmony within the ECAC.

What it reflects is instead a difference of opinion on one important issue which is normal within a large heterogeneous group of colleges of all sizes and types such as that making up the ECAC membership. When Amendment B comes before the Convention, ECAC member colleges will vote as they individually see fit.

This informal statement is being offered in fairness to the membership of both the NCAA and the ECAC. Thank you.

President Plant: The Chair is advised that the sponsor of Amendment IV-A (pages B-2 and B-3), Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, does not desire to make a motion that it be adopted. It has taken a similar position with respect to the other measures that it has proposed (Amendments IV-C and IV-E, pages B-5 through B-7). We are centering our attention now on Amendment IV-A and if there is a representative of Rensselaer who wishes to elaborate on my statement, it is in order to do so. It is also in order, as with any measure having been previously circularized, for anyone authorized to participate in these proceedings to make a motion for its adoption.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): I would like to move the adoption of Amendment IV-A. I believe the rule adopted last year is not fair to all members of the NCAA. I am not necessarily opposed to freshmen playing varsity sports, but when you say that freshmen are eligible except in basketball or football, why may we not say they are not eligible in hockey? Why should the members here today tell 50 playing colleges that freshmen are eligible when they have no interest whatsoever in hockey? We could go on in soccer and lacrosse and so forth. Institutions which have no interest in a particular sport are really regulating that sport.

This resolution should be adopted and next year we should come on the floor of the Convention and vote by sports.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and defeated.)

James H. Witham (University of Northern Iowa): Representing the College Committee, I move delaying consideration of Amendments IV-B, IV-C and IV-D until we have considered IV-E. This is restrictive legislation, and if passed we would not need to consider the other amendments. (The motion was seconded.)

President Plant: The Chair receives this as a motion to postpone to a definite time.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): Did I understand the gentleman to say if Amendment E passes we do not have a chance to come back and discuss Amendments B, C, and D?

President Plant: That is correct. The Parliamentarian has been consulted on this point, and it is his ruling that if Amendment E is moved to the point requested in the agenda and is passed there will be no more voting on the matter of freshman competition because the other measures are restrictive, whereas this one is nonrestrictive.

Mr. Turner: This total proposition is so important we ought to have the opportunity to discuss the increasing or decreasing restrictions in order, in the sense that if you pass Amendment B, for example, you can still pass Amendment E later and it would be less restrictive, but if we pass Amendment E we would not have an opportunity to discuss the merits of Amendments B, C or D, which I think are important.

(A voice vote on the motion to postpone left the Chair in doubt;

a standing vote passed the motion, 149 to 124.)

Mr. Witham: I move the adoption of Amendment IV-E to Article 4, Sections 1 and 2 of the NCAA Bylaws. (The motion was seconded.)

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): What would be the effective date if this legislation passes?

President Plant: On those measures on which the effective date has not been stated, the Chair is prepared to rule that the effective date would be September 1, 1969, with the unanimous consent of the assembly, but if there is not unanimous consent, then a motion and a vote will be taken on the effective date.

J. William Davis (Texas Technological College): I suggest that we have not given what we now have adequate trial and there exists a great difference of opinion. I am not convinced that it has proved to be bad. I recommend that we all vote against every amendment offered on this subject.

Garvin Beauchamp (Abilene Christian College): As a member of the College Committee and the College Football Committee, I suggest that from the standpoint of economy making freshmen eligible might be wise. I suggest that this legislation is reasonable. It allows flexibility.

It is difficult to explain to a basketball player who rooms with a cross country man that his roommate can begin running the first of September, the day of registration, but as a basketball player he cannot play on the varsity squad for one year.

On the College Football Committee, in selecting teams to play in the regional championships, we immediately ask, "How many freshmen have they been playing during the year?"

The coach immediately says, "Well, we have played freshmen, but they will not affect our play," and at the ball game he says, "Well, I didn't know that leaving some of the freshmen at home would affect us so much."

I submit that this is permissive legislation. The larger conferences might not play the freshmen. To the smaller ones, colleges in certain geographical locations, because of economy, it might be an advantage to use freshmen.

Raymond T. Ellickson (University of Oregon): I am the only member of my conference who voted in favor of the freshman rule at the Convention last year, but I certainly did so with the feeling that permission would apply in general to sports where the youngster would have a chance to become a part of his university or college. But we would be put in a very bad light if we passed legislation which would make it possible for freshmen to turn out for football practice, we will say, three or four weeks before the opening of classes. At our institution and I am sure in our conference, we would not do this. But just last year we played two football games before classes began, but at least these games were played by people who had been in school the year before.

Mr. Witham: At the College Division Round Table yesterday we discussed for one-half hour the many merits and demerits of this particular legislation. It seems to me this becomes, as Mr. Beauchamp said, permissive legislation, and actually all may decide whether or not to use the freshmen.

I heard one of the members say yesterday, "My athletic commit-

tee is going to decide this. It isn't the NCAA that is going to decide it." It is kind of like buying an automobile. If you want to buy a Cadillac you go ahead and buy it. If you can only buy a Ford, you buy it.

Also it seems to me I have heard at this Convention and at others that the NCAA is more and more setting down regulations relative to how you should run your athletic program. Gentlemen, this is one piece of legislation where you can say to hell with the NCAA, we will do what we want to.

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): When we voted last year at this Convention on the present freshmen rule it was almost an even split. It did create a situation in the NCAA championships which had not been present before. Certain conferences and certain schools decided that they would not use freshmen, whereas other conferences and schools decided they would in the NCAA championships.

I recommend a vote against Amendment E, because in Amendment D we propose to exclude freshmen competition in NCAA championships, but the conferences or schools who wanted to use their freshmen throughout the year would be able to do so without the penalty that existed before this past year which would charge that boy a year's eligibility. Amendment E does restrict, in effect, those which do not use freshmen in NCAA championships.

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): I would like to speak in favor of Mr. Davis's suggestion that we all vote negative on the entire group of propositions in regard to freshman rule.

I have heard three or four different reasons for having freshmen teams and I have heard three or four different reasons for not having freshmen teams. There are reasons pro and con and even some heterogeneous conferences deciding among themselves which is the best thing to do and why it should be done.

I would remind you that one of our purposes in NCAA is to promote participation, and the only way you are going to economize with freshmen is to put them on the junior varsity.

In our discussion at Monday's Round Table it was brought out that the real problem in rising costs is in trying to keep up with the Joneses. The trouble with permissive legislation is if only one person you like to compete against does something it puts you in the position of having to consider doing it yourself. So if you are going to consider going to national championship events and one team is going to use freshmen, you will have to face the problem of whether or not you are going to use freshmen.

I recognize that having national championships this is one of the prices we have to pay, that we may have to give up some of the authority that we like to have over our athletic program, but permissiveness is not always as permissive as it seems.

This is one thing we have to keep well in mind. Keeping up with the Joneses is to compete equitably in national championships, and it is one thing that keeps our costs high.

Robert F. Ray (University of Iowa): Mr. President, it seems to me this is the kind of issue that very tragically tends to divide the Association. There have been suggestions made that we ought to restructure the whole organization and have a bicameral NCAA or something like that.

The issue with regard to freshman competition is such that many people in the College Division felt in 1968 that they were in fact providing a favor for the University Division by voting for the present freshman rule.

Amendment A and Amendment E are wise in one extent and that is they reflect the extreme view. If Amendment E is passed the point made in regard to the extent of participation is a good one. Major universities will find in many cases the freshman teams will tend to disappear, and as a result you will have less participation rather than more. At the same time with the continuance of the junior varsity squads, if they are continued, you will not enjoy a reduction in cost.

I hope the College Division people will understand the point of view of those in the University Division in regard to this particular issue. I am opposed to Amendment E, because it is entirely too restrictive.

We can compromise this issue. I commend Amendments C or D as an interim step. We can, if time proves that this point of view is not a good one, move in either direction.

The action taken last year was precipitous. I think most people did not anticipate it would pass, and it was only passed by three votes.

Yesterday in the District Four meeting, which had a very large number of representatives from the College Division present, Amendment C was favored by a vote of almost 6 to 1.

James C. Loveless (DePauw University): Bob (Ray), this is not an issue to cause division as you stated. For that reason I would like to express a minority report for the College Division, as all members of the College Division are not for Amendment E, for the same reason we have heard. I recommend that we vote for Amendment D.

Richard P. Koenig (Valparaiso University): I, too, would like to advocate the defeat of this motion.

Valparaiso is a school which could possibly benefit if this motion were passed. We would be in a position to use freshmen in football and basketball. However, in the interest of the national organization I feel that we should defeat this motion.

I would like to remind the members of the College Division that many of them already have the privilege of using freshmen in football and basketball.

We have seen our College Basketball Tournament growing faster and faster, and when you look down the list of champions you find that the very great majority of them have been smaller schools.

(Amendment IV-E was put to vote and defeated, 85 to 209.)

President Plant: The Parliamentarian has ruled that we will consider Amendments B, C and D in that order and the last one to be adopted is the one that will be the action of the Convention.

The Chair hears no motion to adopt Amendment B, therefore he declares that Amendment B is not before the Convention. (See pages B-3 and B-4)

William Wright (Norfolk State College): Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of Amendment C. (See pages B-5 and B-6.) The motion was seconded.)

John Robert Bell (East Tennessee State University): Will a boy

who plays College Division basketball under this provision, be eligible for championship basketball play in addition?

Mr. Wright: I believe it would mean eligibility for all College Division sports.

Mr. Koenig: As I understand this proposal, if a freshman were to win a College Division event in track, for example, he would not be eligible to compete in the University Division championship. Is that correct?

President Plant: That is my understanding.

Mr. Koenig: I advise the College Division members that under this particular rule you would be legislating against some of your men.

Earl C. Lory (University of Montana): Bob Ray just made a fine plea for us not to have a division of the house, and we are setting up a double standard for competition in the University Division and the College Division. I would rather see us together and the defeat of all measures pertaining to the freshman rule.

Donald C. Boardman (Wheaton College): I appreciate Mr. Ray's position. We have to face the fact that universities and colleges are not the same, and we do have a College Division and we have a University Division. We have to recognize that we do have different institutions, even though we have the same name and overall philosophy.

Edwin H. Cady (Indiana University): A number of institutions around the country, including the Big Ten, have a historic tradition against freshmen competition in varsity events. This is a tradition among the faculties. There is no doubt that a good many university faculties around the country were amazed at the permission we gave last year, and I think without any adequate forethought or preparation, partly because our attention was directed then to what looked like a crisis in the 1,600 legislation. There is no question about the fact that our voting as we did was regarded by some of our faculties as a catastrophe. We will suffer a considerable loss of confidence among our faculties if we continue the present rule or if in any one of the ways that are proposed we continue general freshmen participation in varsity events.

There is also the problem which bothered me deeply of seeming to segregate football and basketball from other sports. In the long run the results of doing this, particularly among our faculties, could be very damaging, and almost any of you could be placed in the position eventually in your faculty meeting in which somebody would get up and say, "You have two kinds of sports. You have football and basketball and you have other sports, and you, yourselves, recognize this, and it is now time to do something about these sports which smack a little strongly of professionalism."

Amendment C provides freedom both ways—the freedom to do what is best in everybody's judgment without being imprisoned by competitive necessity of doing what we would on the whole rather not do, partly because our coaches feel they may suffer if they are not able to use their freshmen.

It comes down to the question of equality of competition. Amendment C permits us to have a quality of competition on the College Division level with programs which are accustomed to using freshmen and want to. Amendment C gives us freedom in the University

Division not to use freshmen.

Claude R. Gilstrap (University of Texas, Arlington): If an institution which has declared University Division, but is playing College Divisional football in times qualifies for one of the regional championship bowls, would our freshmen be eligible for this game?

President Plant: The Chair acknowledges almost complete ignorance on the divisions in respect to football and basketball, and I am going to call on the expert, the executive director, Mr. Byers.

Walter Byers (NCAA Executive Director): Thank you, Mr. President. In 21 years, I have only appeared before this Convention once before, and Earl Sneed defeated me rather badly.

The College or University classification is a self-declaration process, applied exclusively to those sports in which there are National Collegiate and National College Division Championships. The answer to your question is: Yes, freshmen would be eligible for College Division regional football.

Clarence Von Eschen (Beloit College): Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the dichotomy embodied in this which is obvious. I think the legislation permitting the College Division athletes to move to the University Championships, was a fine step forward.

During the Pan American years and the Olympic years, the privilege of College Division leaders in track to move forward to the University Championships could serve as a means of qualifying College Division athletes for the Olympic games.

Herbert W. Gallagher (Northeastern University): I think it might be helpful to some members of this Convention to explain the difference between NCAA championship events and NCAA-approved events. As I understand, the football postseason games are in the latter category.

President Plant: The National Collegiate Championship events are specified in the Bylaws, and they do not include football. Football is an NCAA-approved event in the sense that postseason football games must receive the approval of the Extra Events Committee.

(Amendment IV-C was defeated by voice vote)

J. D. Morgan (University of California, Los Angeles): Mr. Chairman, I move that we adopt Amendment IV-D. (See page B-6.) (The motion was seconded.)

Robley C. Williams (University of California, Berkeley): Amendment D prohibits competition by freshmen in NCAA events.

Although we worry about costs, we are still in the education business. We are institutions of higher education, and I do not have to remind you that statistics throughout the country indicate that the largest drop-out rate in colleges and universities occurs in the initial year. Our posture would be very poor indeed if incoming freshmen are allowed to go out for the time-consuming and physically wearing sports of football and basketball, particularly basketball. We should keep in mind that we do have certain parental functions; that is to say, we should arrange our sports programs such that we encourage freshmen to stay.

Ray S. Loomis (University of California, Davis): I rise to speak against the adoption of Amendment D. It creates a dichotomy within the College Division, in that the institution would be prohibited from using its freshmen in NCAA events. The majority of the

schools in this group are using their freshmen in cross country and other events. You would create a situation where you would be dividing your teams at the end of the season for the championship events.

The present freshman rule is more sound for those schools in the College Division than this proposal.

(Amendment IV-D was defeated, 92 to 224.)

Transfer Rule

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): On behalf of Council, I move the adoption of Amendment IV-F (see pages B-7 and B-8) to NCAA Bylaw 4-1-(d). (The motion was seconded.)

There are two parts to this amendment. The first is not a substantive change. It is merely moving the words, "this provision shall not apply," from the end of the exception in the present rule to the beginning of the exception, which I think is the logical place.

The substantive change is a liberalization of the rule. It allows another condition to exist as an exception to the one-year residence requirement. At the present time we have the exceptions that if he is a graduate from a junior college, or he presents 48 semester hours or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit or 24 or 36 hours with a "B" average.

What this amendment does is add another exception: that if the young man predicted 1.600 on the national experience tables and he makes a 2.500 grade average after taking 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours at a junior college, he would be eligible without the one-year residence requirement.

I suggest that if the other exceptions which are found in this Bylaw are sound from an academic standpoint, this exception is also sound. The young man who is affected by this rule could have gone to any four-year college, depending upon the academic standards of admission which may be higher than the national table.

It is believed coming down from a 3.000 to 2.500 would be academically sound if the other exceptions are.

M. R. Clausen (University of Arizona): Clarification is needed on the word "degree." My late beloved colleague, Brad Booth, and I spoke of this, and the word "degree" seemed to cause some confusion, because the admission officers of at least two institutions said they were not able to determine credit sometimes until the man is a senior. It depends on how he plans his program.

Mr. Swank: I wish I could clarify it for you to your satisfaction. I will be frank with you, on my own campus my registrar has asked me the same question.

My personal opinion is that this matter needs to be studied further. At the present time, however, the interpretation that could be made is that if the credit is acceptable by your institution in any degree program, that it is transferable degree credit.

The problem arises if a young man comes to your institution and says, "I am going to go into the College of Engineering" and the College of Engineering doesn't accept a certain course as transferable degree credit. However, if he would go to the College of Arts and Sciences they would accept it as a transferable degree credit. Since it is accepted by some parts of the institution it would be transferable degree credit.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota): I have two reservations concerning the wisdom of adopting this particular amendment. In the first place, we are imposing here a condition upon students who have entered a junior college without knowing anything about the requirements of the NCAA.

An individual who makes a grade point average of 2.500 in a junior college and who did not have a prediction requirement which the NCAA has adopted cannot transfer to one of our institutions and become immediately eligible. On the other hand, his classmate and neighbor who did unknowingly meet the prediction requirement will be eligible.

The second point which would compel me to vote against this proposition is that I believe it lends itself to the farming out of some of the student-athletes to junior colleges with the intent of making them eligible after one year of college.

Mr. Swank: I don't believe that I agree with Dr. Schultze.

First, it does change a little bit the standards which we apply to students, but we have already made that distinction when we adopted the 1.600 rule.

If this rule is not adopted, the two young men who go to junior college, one predicting and the other not predicting, will both have to have a 3.000 grade average to be immediately eligible. This is a liberalization to allow an individual who has made a prediction to have a little less demanding requirement placed upon him. Because of his background, a 2.500 grade average gives an indication he may attain success at a four-year college.

In the second place, this particular amendment would not create a farm-out system. Most universities would rather take a freshman if he predicts, and have him for the first year, especially with the action which we have taken on Bylaw 4-1-(d) this morning.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas): It should be pointed out that the junior college association's concerned participated in the committee's deliberations and endorsed this recommendation.

(Amendment IV-F, pages B-7 and B-8, was passed, 187 to 98.)

Delegate: When will the amendment we just passed go into effect?

President Plant: There was no thought in the Council that if adopted its effectiveness should be delayed, so it would be in effect immediately.

David Swank (University of Oklahoma): I move the adoption of Amendment IV-G (see page B-8). The amendment changes Bylaw 4-1-(d)-(1) so that after the word "at" it reads: "the junior college following his transfer from the four-year college." the bold print. (The motion was seconded.)

The last amendment was a liberalization of the Bylaws. This makes the Bylaw more restrictive, and it places a requirement in the Bylaw to prevent a student from becoming involved in multiple transfer. It is my understanding this amendment arose because of abuses which have occurred during the past year or two. The explanation of this suggested change is better shown by stating what the abuses have been.

A young man has gone to a junior college and attended for three semesters. He is not eligible for immediate aid or participation because of grades and some of the other transfer requirements, but he

transfers to a senior college. He attends that college for a semester and for some reason is dissatisfied and is recruited from that campus by another four-year institution. In order to become eligible he goes back to his junior college in the summertime and graduates, taking the credits which he had attained at his four-year institution, combining those with the credits he has at the junior college, and he is now a graduate. He therefore may go to any other four-year institution and be immediately eligible.

This amendment requires that if he goes back to the junior college, the 24 semester hours are going to have to be earned after his attendance at the four-year institution.

(Amendment IV-G, page B-8, was put to voice vote and passed.)

Harry Arlanson (Tufts University): Amendment IV-H (see page B-8) proposes to grant an exception to the one year calendar residence requirement for alien students who are required to transfer one or more times to complete the study program set by the student's government or the sponsoring educational organization.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of this amendment. (The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.)

Earl M. Ramer (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Proposed Amendment IV-I (see pages B-8 and B-9) to Article 4, Section 1-(d) of the Bylaws is a recognition of the advance in the development of American education. I move its adoption. The motion was seconded.)

In recent years we have witnessed the development of an advanced placement program through college and high school agreements, in which college credit may be earned through the completion of advanced courses under the direction of high schools and through the completion of an examination that has been approved by the colleges concerned. I suppose the most notable example of this can be found in the program of the College Entrance Examination Board.

The proposed amendment is consistent with an important development in American education. It would grant immediate eligibility to a student who had been admitted with a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of such training.

Harry C. Cockrum (Montana State University): Does this apply to a Norwegian student who completes a five-year course and comes into our institution with advanced placement?

Mr. Ramer: Advanced placement examination in the Examination Board?

Mr. Cockrum: Examination with advanced college credit.

Mr. Ramer: As recognized by examination of your institution?

Mr. Cockrum: Yes.

Mr. Ramer: I would assume he would be so recognized.

Mr. Cockrum: In other words, he would not be a transfer student? Correct?

Mr. Ramer: He would not be under that. He has never gone to the college level.

Glenn J. Drahn (Coe College): What about the student who elected to take an accelerated program at the end of the first quarter and goes straight through? This action prohibits summer school, but some of us have summer schools which are in effect a full term, and if he continues in this program, as many of them have professed to

do, he has only three years available to him, which would under this rule mean one freshman and two varsity.

Mr. Ramer: The intent of the amendment is to restrict it entirely to advanced placement credit with no enrollment in college registration in the special programs, so the boy in your example would be excluded.

Mr. Drahn: You mean the boy would be eligible then under those circumstances, or he would not be?

Mr. Ramer: He would not be.

Mr. Drahn: Yet this is a bona fide, regular accelerated program. You only have two varsity years. Is that correct?

Mr. Ramer: This is only through the advanced placement credit. As I understand your illustration, you would have a specialized program through which college enrollment would be involved. Here prior college enrollment is excluded.

Mr. Drahn: I would recommend that we defeat this amendment.

Mr. Ramer: This proposed amendment would involve a very, very small number of individuals. Those of us who are familiar with the advanced placement program recognize that very few students presenting such a credit present more than two or three courses.

Parliamentarian Cross: The proposed Bylaw gives us an exception to when your present freshman year residents qualify. The question that was proposed really concerns a person who has entered and in less than the ordinary academic term becomes a sophomore and eligible at that time under Bylaw 4-1-(e), but has not completed one academic year as defined by the certifying institution. The question is: When does he become a sophomore?

Leland P. Johnson (Drake University): The question is whether or not you have put a cutting level on the advanced placement scores. Institutions can determine their own cutting level, and while it varies greatly from institution to institution the advanced placement suggests No. 3 as the score or cutting level. You have this included in your recommendation.

Mr. Ramer: In my judgment this would be left to the approving institution and even to specific departments within the institution concerned, because they take different stands on this matter.

(Amendment IV-I, pages B-8 and B-9, was put to vote and carried.)

NCAA Athletic Events

Jesse T. Hill (University of Southern California): I move the adoption of Amendment V-A which reads as follows: (Mr. Hill then read the text of the proposed amendments which appear on page B-9.)

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Samuel E. Barnes (Howard University): I move the adoption of Amendment V-B as follows: (Mr. Barnes read the entire text of the proposed amendments which appear on page B-9.)

This amendment merely establishes an additional national collegiate championship which would increase the number from 14 to 15 and would provide for the administration; effective September 1, 1969.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Mr. Hill: I move to amend Bylaws 5-1 and 5-2 as follows: (Mr. Hill then read the text of Amendment V-C which appears on page B-10.)

This is being recommended by the Executive Committee after surveys have shown there is great interest in a National Collegiate Water Polo Championship. It is an Olympic event, as is volleyball, and the Executive Committee at all times has attempted to do what it can to further our abilities in the Olympic movement.

(The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.)

Francis E. Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): I move the amendment of Article 5, Section 1-(b). (See Amendment V-D, page B-10.) (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Arthur R. Reynolds (Colorado State College): The present wording in the last sentence of Article 5, Section 2-(a) of the Bylaws is: "In those instances of College Division competition on a regional basis, the College Committee shall have the responsibility of administering such events."

However, Article 3, Section 3-(a) of the Bylaws provides for the College Football Committee and declares that "The College Football Committee shall arrange for and supervise College Division regional football championships."

Proposed Amendment V-E (see pages B-10 and B-11) eliminates this minor conflict from the wording by adding the clause: "unless a specific committee is established to administer a regional sports program."

The amendment is proposed by the NCAA Council and the intent is to confirm the College Football Committee's authority and to make possible similar authorizations in the future.

Mr. President, I move its adoption.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Milton F. Hartvigsen (Brigham Young University): I move the adoption of Amendment V-F (see page B-11).

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Extra Events

H. Boyd McWhorter (University of Georgia): I move the adoption of Amendment VI-A (see page B-11).

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

I move the adoption of Amendment VI-B (see page B-11).

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Playing and Practice Seasons

Stan Marshall (South Dakota State University): I had hoped this would die a quiet death. I would like to withdraw it (Laughter)

President Plant: Hearing no objection, Amendment VII-A (page B-12) shall be withdrawn.

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): I move the adoption of Amendment VII-B to Article 8, Section 2-(b) of the Bylaws. It was pointed out in the Council that the present section prohibits an institution from assembling their basketball squad to take pictures at the same time they have other campus pictures, and the proposed amendment will make that permissible by adding the following sentence: "however, it shall be permissible to assemble the basket-

ball squad for one day for the purposes of taking squad pictures."

(The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.)

11. REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

Institutional Aid

David Swank: (University of Oklahoma): The first interpretation before you is O.I. 2-(c) which interprets Article 3, Section 1 of the Constitution and deals generally with the problem of gradation and cancellation of athletic grants or awards. (See I-A, page C-1.)

The revision actually adds an example to the language of the present interpretation in order to clarify its meaning.

I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded.)

I approach the discussion of this amendment with a little bit of trepidation. There are obviously considerable problems and questions which have been raised about this.

This interpretation applies to gradation or cancellation of aid. We have to read the present language to see which part of the interpretation it applies to. Institutional aid may be graded or cancelled if the recipient voluntarily renders himself ineligible for intercollegiate competition—obviously this does not apply to that—or fraudulently misrepresents any information on his application, letter-of-intent or tender. In my opinion it does not apply to that. That leaves only the third provision that this example applies to: engages in serious misconduct warranting substantial disciplinary penalty.

We must look to see what type of conduct is manifest disobedience, and we have three types of conduct: disruptive actions which interfere with the normal and orderly conduct of the institution's athletic program; the refusal to meet the normal good conduct obligations required of all team members, and defiance of the normal and necessary directions of departmental staff members.

These are the three categories of conduct which we are talking about.

Manifest disobedience must be the violation of institutional regulations or established athletic department policies and rules applicable to all student-athletes.

This means that it is going to have to be athletic department policy.

The question is raised immediately: What is the meaning of the present language? The last subsection of the existing interpretation reads: "The action is based on institutional policy applicable to the general student body."

This phrase means that institutional policy may be that a college or department may make certain rules and regulations for the conduct of students within that college or department, and the athletic department is just as much a part of the college or university as is the College of Law, the College of Business, or the College of Liberal Arts; so if there is an institutional policy to allow the departments to make certain rules and regulations for the conduct of the students within that department, that is an institutional policy.

There is one other thing we should look at in considering this interpretation and that is the protection written into this example. It isn't the coach or the athletic director who calls the young man in and says, "Kid, you fouled up, you disobeyed what I told you,

you are off the squad and you are not getting any more aid," because that is not what this means.

We must, in order to implement disciplinary action here or the taking of a grant-in-aid or gradating of a grant-in-aid or institutional award, go through normal university channels, in other words, the regular disciplinary or scholarship awards authority of the university. Likewise, there must be due process given to the individual in that he must have an opportunity for a hearing. We must write into that proper notice so that the individual may have some time to prepare himself for a hearing.

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): I rise to react to a little story that appeared in the Shreveport paper on Saturday morning and was in the Los Angeles paper as I recall Saturday afternoon. The particular paragraph was: "Negro athletes who refuse to compete with teams from schools where they feel racial discrimination is practiced."

I submit that in our caucus yesterday it was well established that the legislation was neither white nor black, but several people have asked those of us who come from schools of predominantly Negro students where we stand on this. We also feel there are several questions we should ask.

The people are asking us: Is this legislation the result of articles that appeared in *SPORTS ILLUSTRATED* last summer? I want to give several examples and ask some questions of the gentlemen represented.

I went to graduate school in the Middle West right after World War II. The gentleman who asked me to go to this institution told me it was a good school with friendly people where you could get a good education. I agreed with everything he told me. I was rather impressed with the institution, however, there were several things he did not tell me. He did not tell me I could not get my hair cut in this particular city. The black students had to ride 28 miles to the next town to get a haircut.

We had one student who did not go along with this. Why? The Negro barber over there was always slightly intoxicated. My friend said he had one idiosyncrasy—he didn't want a drunk man to put a razor to his head. [Laughter] Consequently, this particular student-athlete would go home to get his hair cut. Home was Chicago, about four hours away and \$10.69 on the Rocket, and he would miss football practice.

Is this disruptive when he misses practice? Can the coach then turn him in to the scholarship committee and say he missed football practice because he went to Chicago to get a haircut?

When I was seeking another degree at the university, all the basketball players would import a barber and all of them would get Afro haircuts. If these boys failed to get a haircut or if they have Afro haircuts is that an example of refusal to meet good conduct obligations required of all team members?

It appears to us that in this interpretation we need an extra interpretation. We used to go to another state where they had relays and when the white student-athletes went to the hotel and the black student-athletes went across the track, the coach was happy because he was spending less money. If they had the team meeting

scheduled in the hotel would it be disruptive if several of the black people didn't get there?

I will submit that most of the things I am talking about happened immediately after World War II, but I was on my particular university campus last month, and when I looked at the daily paper they had interviewed 28 black athletes to see if they were happy. Four said they were happy. Two of the four were married. Two were engaged. The others said they were unhappy; that the social structure was oriented for white student-athletes. If the coaches told these boys not to be interviewed is this freedom of speech under the First Amendment or construed to be disruptive action under the interpretation that we are asked to adopt?

Mr. Swank: If we were leaving this up to the athletic director or to the coach of the particular sport, there might be real abuses. As our faculties become more cognizant of the problems of the minority groups there is less of a possibility that the institution is going to consider this serious misconduct.

If an institution would engage in a concerted effort to discriminate and say, "Well, because you are wearing an Afro haircut obviously you are violating team rules and it is serious misconduct," there is still in the NCAA Council to which the athlete can go, to make sure that the institution is not terminating or is not actually taking minor disciplinary problems and making them into serious misconduct and running the student-athlete off.

I wholeheartedly agree with your colleague in regard to his idiosyncrasy about having a razor on his head by a drunken barber.

Mr. Henry: I was asking about this because one student-athlete would go home to get a haircut, and home to him happened to be Chicago, and he missed team practice. He missed practice because he could not get a haircut in that particular city. Is that failing to live up to the team obligation?

Mr. Swank: My personal opinion, Mr. Henry, is it would not be. The young man goes to the coach and says, "My hair is getting long and I need to get a haircut. I cannot get one here in town. I would like to go to Chicago." If he takes steps to advise his athletic department what he is doing, I don't see how this could be interpreted by any faculty committee as disruptive action if the coach says, "You are not going; you are going to stay here." The young man says, "I have to get a haircut." The coach should see the need or requirement of a haircut for the individual.

I doubt this would be considered serious disruptive action by the faculty of that university.

I doubt if the coach said, "I don't want anybody to talk to a newspaper man" and an athlete talked to a newspaper man, that any faculty would consider this serious misconduct.

There are enough protective devices in this amendment that it will not be used as a means to suppress the student athlete, regardless of the color of the skin.

H. Frank Leftwich (Tuskegee Institute): I notice you said "athletic department policies and rules." Do you write down all of your policies and regulations? Are these written down somewhere?

The problem we ran into is action that is taken on policies that are not written down. Lots of times we have an understanding of

policies, it is the consensus of opinion that this is what we consider proper behavior and proper action.

We closed our school last spring because of some disruptive actions and the Federal Court sought to get everybody back. Many of the policies and regulations that we considered understood were not written down or published where students could read them. As a result, those persons and committees who were assigned to take action had no ground to stand on.

Mr. Swank: I agree with you. The Federal Courts of this country are going to require that our student-athletes, like the rest of our student body, are entitled to know what the rules and regulations are and that rules and regulations cannot be considered or established by a glance of the coach on a moment's notice.

You are going to have to write your policies down, and it is probably a good idea, because we can put them down in black and white and see exactly what they are and what they mean.

Raford Boddy (State University of New York, Buffalo): In my experience, the NCAA has a very good record in cancelling grants-in-aid, and a very important part of that is the last sentence which says: "the action is based on institutional policy applicable to the general student body."

The example below is not so much an example as an extra interpretation, which talks in terms of established athletic policy applicable to all student-athletes rather than to all students. The example brings up the question of normal and necessary direction, normal good conduct.

These changes are going to make real problems for the NCAA. I have faith in the committees that they will find the justice if the student recognizes he can have a hearing. In cases where this is handled informally, which is done in some of the larger schools, the committee will look at this interpretation and say, "Oh, in the light of this the coach not only has the right to take the guy off the team but to suggest that his grant-in-aid be cancelled, and we will be living up to NCAA policy by doing so," and the matter will stop there.

I strongly urge that this example, which I take to be an interpretation, be deleted.

Carl Abner (University of Louisville): This is a very, very serious issue. I was sorry to see the discussion degenerate in terms of color or race. There are some fundamental issues that have to be determined.

Through this example, the NCAA is becoming the administrator or the athletic department and the coach. It seems to me we have always held to a basic principle that the student-athlete is not to be treated differently than any other student, yet here we are creating different conditions under which the student-athlete would be disciplined.

I agree with the previous speaker that the phrase, "based on institutional policy applicable to the general student body," covers everything necessary. The student-athlete would be disciplined as any other student through the normal disciplinary channels within the institution.

Al Negratti (University of Portland): We always say the athlete

is the same as the other students when, as a matter of fact, he isn't. He is brought in, whether we like to accept it or not, on grant-in-aid, specifically to participate in sports activities. Therefore, he is different from the regular student who is paying his own way.

We have had some problems ourselves, and we are very concerned to find an official interpretation to tell us what to do when a young man quits the team or refuses to participate. How do you handle that? Here are all these different interpretations—it has to be a disruptive action, collusion has to be proven, due process of law, and you say we have to be careful because we don't want to appear to treat them differently. You bring in young men and give them grants-in-aid for up to two or three thousand dollars a year; if that isn't pay I don't know what it is.

We never want to accept that. But I am still waiting for someone to tell me what to do with the young man who used to participate and quits. You have him on grant-in-aid and keep him on it. You can't cancel it. You bring him in on the play-and-pay basis, whether we like to admit it or not.

Mr. Swank: I don't want anyone to get the idea this example would allow conduct by universities just described by the past speaker. If a young man does not choose to play or participate, I don't see how that could ever be interpreted as a manifest disobedience. You give him a grant-in-aid award, and you say, "If you come to our institution." If he then chooses for some reason of his own not to play or participate, you cannot cancel a grant-in-aid award solely for that choice.

I don't think this interpretation would ever be used to condone that action. I don't think the Council or the Convention is ready to go so far as to allow this type of conduct by the university. The interpretation calls for a due process, and as a lawyer I feel that any student-athlete is entitled to just as much due process as any other student. I believe this will give it to him.

Mr. Negratti: I know my example cannot come under manifest disobedience and I am sorry I gave you that impression. What I am saying is: Is there anything that can be done, or can a young man quit at any time and the institution is obligated to keep him on grant-in-aid? Does the university have any recourse at all, or should they have any recourse?

Mr. Swank: Let me say this so we don't cloud the issue. Before we decide that one, we should resolve this particular problem. I suggest that your university at the next Convention sponsor legislation to allow what you propose.

Ernest C. Casale (Temple University): As chairman of the NCAA Eligibility Committee, I have had quite a few questions about this particular interpretation. It was proposed to me that sideburns be limited to the cheekbone and there be no beards. What is the answer to that?

Mr. Swank: We say it is proper that the faculty of the university have some say-so in the conduct of athletics. Many of our universities today might say the hair should be cut and not worn shoulder length when going out for the wrestling team; that might cause some problems. But I think there are reasonable regulations of the athletic department.

Mr. Casale: Is your answer that nothing can be done about any kind of haircut?

Mr. Swank: It is almost impossible to answer your question and say that in this situation this will or will not do. It depends upon the student's conduct.

President Plant: I doubt that we are going to make much progress by taking up individual cases. I would hesitate to try to say on specific cases what is reasonable and what is not. What we try to do is set up a situation whereby the question can be raised and due process given.

It is unbelievable to me that the modern faculty would find it within this framework to have a hair style that the coach thought was improper, unless it would relate to some problem such as long hair in the wrestling team.

Mr. Swank: Action taken within the scope of this must be something which your regular faculty disciplinary committee will say constitutes serious misconduct warranting substantial disciplinary penalty.

The purpose of this entire O.I. is to prevent the "runoff." That is really the only thing we are trying to do. We are not trying to solve all the disciplinary problems in the university, but simply to prevent the "runoff."

M. R. Clausen (University of Arizona): About three years ago I had the dubious honor of presenting this particular interpretation. When we were on this in the Council meeting, I mentioned the specific example at the University of Arizona.

A young man who came out for football in the fall was very unhappy about being placed on the third or fourth or fifth team, and he wasn't at practice. The coaching staff persuaded him to come back. After two or three or four or five weeks he walked out again. The coaches were unhappy that he was walking out and he was unhappy that he was on the fourth or fifth team. They went back and got him and he came back, and at the end of a few days he walked off again.

I said to the Council, "By this interpretation, could this man be referred to the appropriate disciplinary authorities on that campus?" and the consensus was, "Yes."

The heavy weight was on the last three sentences of that interpretation. The institution does have recourse.

Harvey J. Jessup (Tulane University): There are probably rules and regulations contiguous to student-athletes which are not contiguous to the regular student body.

At Tulane, the normal student is allowed to have alcohol in his room and may have female visitation, which is not allowed in the athletic department. If we had a youngster drinking in his room under the normal rules and regulations of the University it would be condoned. It is one protection we are now putting back into legislation.

Anthony C. Morella (American University): I want to applaud the Council for its attempt here to expand on an interpretation in an extremely difficult area.

I can also understand the sensitivity of the membership here, because in one respect this does smack of providing interpretive standards for student-athletes different from those for other stu-

dents at the institution.

Implicit within the interpretation is ample ground for the athletic department to take care of the disciplinary problems. The whole question found in the current interpretation with respect to breach of discipline can accommodate the athletic department.

There is assurance therein that such gradation or cancellation of aid can only be taken by a duly constituted body after opportunity for a hearing. There already exists a large number of cases wherein the courts will see that the institutions are assuring and guaranteeing due process.

Therefore, although I applaud the Council for this generous gesture to assist the institutions and particularly the athletic departments, I think the wiser course of action would be to delete this example from the interpretation.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): I would agree that due process might take care of this except for the unfortunate interpretation that is put on the last sentence of the existing statement: "applicable to the general student body."

If this is being interpreted literally that there is no special treatment or special requirement for the student-athlete, then the student-athlete can get drunk and we cannot bring any due process to bear.

The example added by the Council clarifies it. We can adopt an athletic department policy and not make it applicable to all our students.

Raford Boddy (State University of New York, Buffalo): Under this interpretation, the cleavage between the athletic department and the rest of the university will grow, not diminish, because you are saying that you consider it unfortunate that the existing faculty and administration allow your students and your athletes to do things that you prefer they do not do.

Let's be clear that the issue is not whether this person can be a member of your team; that is the coach's prerogative. What we are talking about is the loss of one or two grants-in-aid awarded through the financial aid office.

So that you don't increase the cleavage between the faculty and the athletic director, I strongly urge you to strike the example from this interpretation. [Applause]

President Plant: This measure requires a two-thirds vote. The vote is 181 to 86 and it appears that the measure passed. In view of the closeness of the vote, the Chair is inclined to ask for a ballot vote, and as quite a few people have left the room, we will have a ballot vote at 1:30 on this issue.

(The session recessed at 12:10 p.m.)

BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Afternoon, January 8, 1969

The Business Session reconvened at 1:35 p.m., President Plant presiding.

President Plant: As I announced before our recess, we will have a vote by ballot. There is no further debate on the issue.

I have one question, however, to put before the Convention. After we had recessed, one of the delegates said he had to leave and asked if he could leave his ballot with another person to cast the vote. We do not permit proxy voting. The Constitution is clear on that. His response to that was that this was not a discretionary vote, that he was leaving the ballot with the individual merely to put in the box so that the recount might be accurate.

I agreed that I would put the matter to the Convention, and if unanimous consent appears, put his ballot in the box. It is a somewhat moot point, whether that is proxy voting or whether it is just a matter of recounting the ballot to make sure it was accurate.

Is there any objection to putting the ballot in the box? If any person says he objects, it will not be put in the box.

Earl C. Lory (University of Montana): I object. I think it is a proxy vote.

President Plant: Mr. Lory objects on the ground that this is, in effect, proxy voting, and so the ballot will not be cast.

(The ballot vote approved Interpretation I-A (page C-1), 167-79.) There is a technical point with respect to the earlier adoption of Amendment IV-F (pages B-7 and B-8). If you look in the Bylaws you will find that paragraph (d) also has subparagraphs (1) and (2) and subsequently, indeed in the next action, paragraph (1) was amended. It was the intention of the Council, and the Chair rules, that by the adoption of Amendment IV-F, paragraphs (1) and (2) were not affected. The only effect was by Amendment IV-G which was subsequently passed.

In connection with Interpretation I-B (page C-1) which was withdrawn, the question has been raised that the very existence of that proposal has created questions in the minds of delegates on the repurchase of complimentary tickets.

To explain that, I would like to call on a member of the Infractions Committee, Parliamentarian Cross, to delineate the policy of the NCAA in that respect.

Parliamentarian Cross: If it is the policy to make complimentary tickets available to the student-athlete they are in fact his tickets, and at that point he can do what he will with them.

We recognize, of course, there is a possibility of the abuse of the thought behind this which is that he can permit his parents or close friends to watch him play. He can scalp them or make some kind of

arrangement in violation of the spirit of the rule which will give him, in practical matter, some financial aid beyond the general recognized limit.

Some conferences have adopted as a protective device a ruling that to avoid the abuse of complimentary ticket ownership they would permit the institution to purchase that ticket from the athlete, and the Infractions Committee's thinking has been that there is nothing that precludes this. I won't say it was affirmatively encouraged, but it has been tolerated.

It is a problem that has to be thought through with some effort to delineate permissible activity. The complimentary ticket is designed as a courtesy to permit the student-athlete to pay a compliment to those to whom you would normally expect him to, and the department of course extending that compliment. It is clearly not designed to permit a subterfuge increase in financial aid.

If the institution or the conference has a policy of trying to prevent abuse by buying back tickets, it is tolerated but not encouraged.

President Plant: Interpretation I-C (page C-2) seems to be a minor change, involving the insertion of the words "guarantee of bond." The OI refers to special arrangements which may not be made for the athlete as for other members of the student body, including such things as discounts in purchases, loans without interest, indefinite or special arrangements on installment payments and regular or periodic use of an automobile without charge. The Council has inserted the words "guarantee of bond."

(A motion was regularly made, seconded, put to vote and carried to approve the interpretation.)

Awards

James R. McCoy (Ohio State University): I move that we adopt Interpretation II-A (pages C-2 and C-3). (The motion was seconded.)

James McCoy: I wish to move Amendment No. 2 (page C-3). The result is that an additional paragraph will be added as noted in Amendment No. 2. (The motion to amend was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

This has been an area of considerable difficulty for the Association's headquarters which has received numerous requests as to what awards are permissible. Two years ago in Houston a proposal was made to improve OI 19 and OI 20, which was withdrawn. This is an attempt to provide an interpretation of what is permissible in the way of institutional or conference awards and awards by other organizations approved by the institutions or conferences.

Ray Ellickson (University of Oregon): The interpretation states that "Individual awards to student-athletes shall be limited to . . ." The Oregon Invitational Track Meet is an indoor meet held in January which often attracts many competitors who are not student-athletes. I am told this interpretation will be applied to these competitors even though they are not student-athletes.

Many people interpret "Awards . . . may include," to say while it may include these it may include other things as long as the cost is not over \$75.

The meet of which I speak is held in Portland, Oregon. It is run by a number of alumni of both the University of Oregon and Oregon

State University. These alumni have tried very hard to use products which are identified with the Portland area as suitable awards in this meet.

Many of you have heard of the Pendleton Woolen Mill. In the past, awards have included Pendleton blankets which have woven into them "Oregon Invitational Track Meet." I am told by the chairman of the Extra Events Committee that we will not be able to use these as a suitable award in such a meet, but we are allowed to take a \$75 watch, but not allowed to give a \$25 Pendleton blanket, even though it carries woven into the blanket this inscription, "Oregon Invitational Track Meet."

These people have awarded in the past cutlery, carrying the inscription, "Awarded on the basis of competition, Oregon Invitational Track Meet." It would be difficult to take this down to a pawnshop and get very much on it, surely not as much as you could get from a \$75 watch. Yet I understand the Extra Events Committee, on instructions of the Council, will not allow this group to use such an award.

I realize that it would be out of order for me to suggest an amendment, but I urge the Council to add "or merchandise manufactured in the locality or closely identified with the locality in which the event occurs and carries an inscription which identifies that merchandise by the name of the event."

President Plant: You have been well advised because if there are college athletes in the meet the awards must comply with our rule.

J. William Davis (Texas Technological College): Would it be possible for us to accept portions of this amendment and not other portions?

President Plant: The ruling of the Parliamentarian is that the amendment is in its entirety and it must be taken entirely or rejected entirely.

Mr. Davis: I was also concerned that you can't give the blanket. I thought we could give a Texas hat, but I suppose that would be as illegal as an Oregon blanket. We have traditionally at the Cotton Bowl given a Texas hat. There is no particular value to the hat except for sentimental reasons.

Am I correct that we could not give the hat?

James McCoy: While we have not tried to be all-inclusive in the list, we have listed those awards that are traditional. If you contemplate making an award that is not included, I suggest you secure a ruling on what you propose to award. I don't think it is intended that this be entirely confined to the items listed.

James W. Orwig (Indiana University): I refer your attention to the last sentence of the proposal, "Neither paragraph (b) nor (c) permits individual awards in recognition of specialized outstanding performances in particular contests or events."

At Indiana University each year, usually following the Olympic Games, we have had a special awards ceremony for the Indiana students who have represented the United States and foreign nations in the Olympic Games. One of the things done at this particular dinner is to give each of the persons participating—they are all enrolled students at the University of Indiana—a plaque in recognition of their contribution to the Olympic Games movement.

The plaque is approximately \$3 to \$5 in value. The question I pose to you, Dean McCoy, is would we be permitted to continue to do this? We already have plans to honor these young people sometime during the month of February.

James McCoy: I suggest you present this for specific approval, so there will be no doubt as to whether it falls within this interpretation or not.

J. Neils Thompson (University of Texas, Austin): I applaud the Council in its effort to cope with this problem, because it is one of great concern, but I must say that to cover the spectrum of awards in a few paragraphs is a most difficult challenge.

The thing that concerns me specifically, being on the Postgraduate Scholarship Committee, is to see there is a wording, for example, of "scholar athlete awards."

I have for a number of years promoted at our institution postgraduate scholarships. This Association has done a great deal in the area of postgraduate scholarships, but I am concerned about this wording.

I would hate to tell our alumni and others when we have made such an effort for the development of postgraduate scholarships for those of scholarly attainment participating in sports, that this is now eliminated.

James McCoy: I recognize the subject of postgraduate scholarship awards is complex in itself, and I suggest you might very well want to investigate that specifically. I don't think it was our intent to cover that subject.

C. D. Henry (Grambling College): I would like to ask a question on the phrase, "may not provide more than one award in recognition of a student's athletic accomplishment." If the student wins two events in a track meet can he get an award for each, whereas the man on the football team can get only one?

James McCoy: The Council believes it would be for each accomplishment. If he won the 100-yard dash, the 200-yard dash and the 400, he could get three awards.

Edward W. Malan (Pomona College): I understood the Chair to confirm the interpretation of Mr. Ellickson from Oregon that this interpretation prohibits giving awards to nonstudent-athletes except those which may be given to student-athletes.

President Plant: If it is a meet in which eligible college student-athletes participate as well as nonstudents and the meet is subject to Extra Events Committee approval, the award then must be in conformity with our rules, because you cannot predict who is going to win the event.

Mr. Malan: Is this not an extension of the Association's authority in a similar direction to that for which we have criticized the AAU?

President Plant: The answer I think on that is: "No." (Laughter)

Mr. Malan: I must submit that that is debatable.

Howard Grubbs (Southwest Athletic Conference): We have two problems; awards for sports events where the individual may win several events, such as a track meet, and awards for team events. I believe firmly that legislation along this line is good.

The \$75 limit is perhaps a little high for the track meet events. The \$75 limit for the football team that wins the national champion-

ship is a little bit low.

Legislation should be devised to separate the two. It is rather ridiculous for one youngster, according to the rules, to be able to win three awards in the track meet, and the football or basketball team that wins the national championship after a complete season be limited to one \$75 award.

Ray Ellickson (University of Oregon): I assume the Council in making interpretations would depend upon statements which appear in the Constitution or the Bylaws. Do you find in the Constitution or the Bylaws the statement that the student-athlete can compete only in Extra Events or meets where the award that is made to nonstudent-athletes must conform with the NCAA rules for student-athletes?

President Plant: This is part of Bylaw 7B relating to track and field, and Bylaw 7C relating to gymnastics.

(Proposed interpretation II-A, as amended, was defeated, 103 to 127.)

Financial Aid

Arthur R. Reynolds (Colorado State College): Proposed OI's 46 and 47 (III-A and B, page C-3) are intended to clarify fully the wording of Article 3, Section 4 of the Constitution which concerns the granting of financial aid to student-athletes.

Constitution 3-4-(c) states, "In all cases, the institutional agency making the award of aid shall give the recipient a written statement of the amount, duration, conditions and terms thereof."

Proposed OI 46 states that the chairman of the scholarship or grants-in-aid committee must sign the written statement; the athletic director's signature alone is not satisfactory.

I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried, 230-0.)

Proposed OI 47 provides that if an institution renews the grant-in-aid of a student-athlete it must give the recipient another written statement of the amount, duration, conditions and terms thereof, and the statement must be given to the recipients within three weeks of the end of the spring term.

I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded.)

Robert R. Peck (Boston University): Our university doesn't follow this procedure with normal students, not just student-athletes. It is going to be very difficult to get the university to change its procedures. The awards are made in the middle of the summer for all students. Would we be in violation?

Mr. Reynolds: I would say you would be, if this OI is adopted.

Mr. Peck: I submit that it is way out of line that we have to do something especially for the athletes.

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): There will be some mechanical difficulties in implementing this interpretation. Let us consider the case of a student who chooses to go to summer school and the grades are not available until after completion of summer school. If he must be given an instrument concerning the renewal of his grant-in-aid within three weeks after the termination of the spring term, he does not have a chance to count his summer work. This presents insurmountable difficulties.

It has been pointed out that in some cases we have college stu-

dents who come out for the first few days of practice and suddenly decide, "This is not for me." If they have been given that award they take deliberate advantage of this and decide, "Well, I am just going to go on as I have been."

I urge the Convention to oppose this amendment because it presents in many cases insurmountable technical difficulties, and it puts the institution in an awkward position in that it removes some elements of protection against the unscrupulous individual.

Mr. Reynolds: The Council has considered the problem of the student who goes to summer school whose grades might not be available within three weeks after the end of the term, and it is the expectation that institutions would make their renewal of the grant contingent upon the student's being eligible in the fall for the sport in which he participates.

John Kane (University of Arkansas): Suppose the school notifies the student-athlete within three weeks after the end of the spring semester that his grant-in-aid will not be renewed. Then suppose that on September 1 the institution decides it would like to renew the grant-in-aid.

Would the renewal at that time be in violation of this interpretation?

Mr. Reynolds: This question was not examined by the Council, but I think that if you did not renew within three weeks, this would be the end of the grant you had given. If at a subsequent date you decided to give to the student an entirely new grant, that you would be within your power to do so. It would not be a renewal of the original grant.

Mr. Kane: I am doubtful of the Association's study of this particular time period. I had no particular feeling about it as far as my own institution is concerned, but the comments from individuals preceding me led me to believe this may need some further study.

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): First of all, there is the problem of the athletic directors of institutions who wish to make grants-in-aid which the committees sometimes are not prepared to meet.

There is an issue that is more important, as I see it, which is that a couple of years ago we all terminated about the end of June to get our grades out. And now is it going to be a month longer? This we think is quite a problem.

President Plant: If I may reply to you, as I did express a moment ago, this year grants could be made contingent upon the student's grades being satisfactory.

John Semanik (Drexel Institute of Technology): The end of our academic year is not until the end of the summer quarter. We are on the fourth quarter. Will your last statement apply in this case?

Mr. Reynolds: You can make the grant as of three weeks after the end of your spring term, contingent upon successful grades.

Mr. Schultze: The statement has been made that if an institution at a late date decides to make an award to an individual who had one previously, this must be counted as a new award.

In the Big Ten Conference, and in many institutions, we are limited by the number of initial awards that can be made annually. In other words, a renewal of an award to an individual who had one the pre-

vious year under these circumstances would impose upon us the serious decrease in the number of awards we can make to the incoming students.

(Proposed interpretation III-B (page C-3) was defeated, 9 to 196.)

Eligibility for NCAA Events

Harry Arlanson (Tufts University): Proposal IV-A (pages C-3 and C-4) would revise OI 101 by adding a passage which is essentially an enlargement of the OI. If a student-athlete spends one year at a second four-year institution and his academic program is recommended by the appropriate academic officer at the original institution, he will be permitted to return to his initial institution and be immediately eligible for NCAA events. The student must be in good standing when he leaves the initial institution.

This has the support of the Council and was recently enacted in ECAC legislation.

I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Marshall Turner (Johns Hopkins University): I move the adoption of proposed interpretation IV-B (page C-4). (The motion was seconded.)

I move the adoption of Amendment to Amendment No. 3. (The motion to amend was seconded, put to vote and carried.)

This proposal simply provides for the handling of foreign students in a normal manner, with the exception of those coming in under bona fide exchange programs, and the definition of a bona fide exchange student is given in this revision.

Ray Ellickson (University of Oregon): We have an exchange program with the Netherlands School of Business. I would say these students are bona fide exchange students, and yet as I read the definition of a bona fide student I cannot see these students coming under that description.

I don't think that the Netherlands School of Business is similar to the U.S. Department of State or Rotary International or the Ford Foundation or the Institute of International Education.

Mr. Turner: The Parliamentarian has indicated that it might be possible to stretch "similar organizations" to include what you mean, but it would be an awful long stretch.

It has been suggested that perhaps these already established and thoroughly educational exchanges between foreign institutions and institutions in this country might be presented to the Council for specific approval.

President Plant: It is suggested that we might take care of this problem, which was not considered by the Council, by saying, "A bona fide foreign exchange student," instead of, "is one who is sent by his government" make it "includes one who is sent by his government." That would carry out the intent of the Council, and if there is no objection on the part of the assembly, the Chair would rule that that change will be made. (The amended proposal IV-B was put to voice vote and carried.)

Samuel E. Barnes (Howard University): Proposed revision IV-C (pages C-4 and C-5) would add the words "Indoor and outdoor track and field shall be considered separate sports," to OI 106. The

intent is that since there are separate championships in these sports, this addition would be equitable and would not prevent anyone from participating fully in both seasons.

I move this proposal be adopted.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Milton F. Hartvigsen (Brigham Young University): Proposal IV-D would add OI 110 (see page C-5). I move that the amendment be adopted. (The motion was seconded.)

I move we amend proposed interpretation IV-D by deleting the present paragraph and substituting Amendment to Amendment No. 4. (Mr. Hartvigsen read Amendment No. 4 and the motion was subsequently seconded.)

Robley C. Williams (University of California, Berkeley): Does "initially enters a college or university after the first term," mean the fall term?

Mr. Hartvigsen: It could be after the fall semester or it could be following the second quarter.

Mr. Williams: Our institution is on the quarter system and year-round operation. The academic year starts with the summer quarter. I assume that is the first quarter under this ruling.

President Plant: The Chair would be inclined to rule that it could, in the absence of objection. I am sure the Council intended it should be the fall or autumn term.

R. S. Loomis (University of California, Davis): The intent of the OI, as I understood it, was if a student began his participation as a freshman and then during the season of that sport he became a sophomore he could continue on the freshman squad. The amendment, however, is entirely different in meaning. If he wasn't able to compete or didn't compete during the first year as a freshman, he then as a sophomore may participate on the freshman team. I think the substitution says something entirely different than the intent of the amendment.

Mr. Hartvigsen: If he does not participate as a freshman, he will begin his freshman year the next academic year. If he begins at the start of the second term, the freshman year will terminate at that same time in the subsequent year, which means he could have freshman eligibility beginning February 1 and ending January 31 the following year. That will continue throughout his four years, and his eligibility will terminate at that time. If he were to complete his freshman year and not participate in the second year he would have the full three years.

Mr. Loomis: This seems to run counter to what we passed this morning in regard to advanced standing.

(Amendment to Amendment No. 4, page C-5, was defeated by voice vote.)

President Plant: The amendment to the amendment has been defeated and now before us is Amendment IV-D.

Mr. Loomis: I believe there is a typographical error. "Second quarter," should be changed to "third quarter."

Parliamentarian Cross: The Council is the only agency that can interpret and the Convention eventually accepts or rejects the interpretation.

The intention here is inadvertently incorrectly stated, and this

could be corrected by striking "second quarter" and making it "third quarter." It has an awkwardness in the last line, but I don't think you ought to take it too seriously.

This concerns the youngster who comes back at mid-year or perhaps starts, leaves and comes back at an odd time of year. He will have a pre-sophomore status, but he cannot compete as a freshman and he is not going to be on the varsity. This will enable him to continue as a freshman in competition, even though he is in the sophomore year academically.

President Plant: Would the assembly agree to the insertion of the words "second or third"?

Hearing no objection, the Chair will rule that those words are in the language.

Mr. Williams: There is still the difficulty in the last line, "during his first term of residence." Here, of course, is meant the preceding term or terms.

President Plant: The Chair agrees and will add those words unless there is objection. The phrases now read, "the second or third quarter," and at the end, "during his preceding term or terms of residence."

(Proposed interpretation IV-D, page C-5, was put to vote and carried, 183 to 15.)

1.600 Rule

James H. Weaver (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move that we adopt Interpretation V-A (page C-5). (The motion was seconded.)

I move that we amend this proposal in the fashion that appears in Amendment No. 5. (The motion was seconded.)

Under our present legislation it is possible for a nonpredictor, a student who graduated from high school and did not predict 1.600, to enter junior college, come to an NCAA institution and be permitted to play if he achieves a 1.600 at the junior college.

If this is adopted it would require that he either be graduated from junior college, or present a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 2.500 accumulative grade point average in order to be eligible under this legislation.

Edward Krause (University of Notre Dame): The words, "for financial aid, participation in athletics or organized practice sessions at an NCAA member institution," have been deleted in the amendment to the proposal and the words, "under this legislation," have been added. In effect, aren't you saying exactly the same thing?

Mr. Weaver: Yes, it probably is a little simpler this way.

(Amendment No. 5 to Interpretation V-A was put to voice vote and carried.)

John Kane (University of Arkansas): Will the same principle apply with the requirement of 2.500 accumulative grade point average indefinitely as the student goes into the third, fourth and possibly his fifth year, or after a time will he be eligible with a 1.600?

Mr. Weaver: I would say if he came to you with a 2.500 and then he fell down to the 1.600, I would believe he would be qualified to be eligible.

Mr. Kane: If he comes with less than a 2.500, will he have to

achieve a 2.500 at sometime to become eligible at the institution to which he transferred, or could he qualify at some later time if he made a 1.600 during the first full year at the new institution?

Mr. Weaver: I think so.

Mr. Kane: It seems to me this is fairly important. I would hope that these things would be clearly spelled out in the legislation. I am in doubt, too. I feel that it is an important question and should be cleared up before this is adopted.

President Plant: In the minds of the Council, it is clear this does not stay with him all his academic life. If he comes with less than 2.500 then for one year he is subject to the requirements of the rule.

R. S. Loomis (University of California, Davis): I should like to emphasize that this legislation would provide no remedy for that student who is admitted at 2.500 to ever become eligible, so it is important we defeat this interpretation.

Apparently this body is seeing the college situation in California, where the student is not originally eligible at the four-year institution and then goes to junior college. If a student transfers with less than 2.500, graduation is not germane because courses in junior colleges are not pertinent to the four-year program. Most of the state colleges and universities accept the student with 36 or 60 units.

You are setting up something that would be extremely restrictive beyond the transfer rule itself. This paragraph was a liberalized feature among several of the transfer rules.

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): There is some confusion here, particularly as one of the speakers noted the legislation amending the basic 1.600 rule. This deals with institutional eligibility in NCAA events. There is nothing on the individual eligibility of the individual student.

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): The Bylaw itself provides that an individual coming into an institution, regardless of whether he is a transfer or beginning student, who does not predict 1.600 and after the first year earns a 1.600 average, is eligible for participation.

The answer is that it does not prevent or limit him from obtaining eligibility after one year.

Robley C. Williams (University of California, Berkeley): Mr. Fuzak may have the right idea, except that Article 4, Section 6 of the Bylaws says an institution shall not be eligible unless it limits its subsequent scholarship and grant-in-aid awards to those student-athletes who have a grade point average of at least 1.600. What this proposed interpretation says is a boy can come from a junior college into an institution and make straight 4.000 for one year and he is still ineligible, or the institution which allows him to play is ineligible to enter in NCAA events.

(Proposed interpretation V-A, page C-5, was approved, 103-86.)

John Fuzak (Michigan State University): I move we adopt proposed interpretation V-B (page C-6). (The motion was seconded.)

The amendment to the proposal is really a clarification of the language and also provides an effective date. It is Amendment No. 6 (see page C-6).

The modification provides an effective date; September 1, 1969. It also modifies the language, "If the secondary school certifies," in

place of that "states in writing that class rank is unavailable, the student's grade point average as certified by the high school may be used and prediction obtained through the use of a conversion table developed by the Association."

As is often the case, this interpretation comes about primarily through some abuses. It has come to the attention of the Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements that the provision that either the grade point average or rank could be used resulted in some juggling to see which came out the best. Actually our tables were developed through the use of rank and permission to use grade average came about because in some instances the rankings were not available. So now the amendment provides that where rank is not available and the high school states that it is not available, it is then possible to use grade point average through a conversion table.

We found that some colleges chose to determine the grade point average rather than use that determined by the high school, so we are specifying that the grade point average determined by the high school shall be used.

There is one other point that has to do with the preparatory school. After looking at a good many cases, the Committee felt that it was inappropriate to utilize one year in preparatory school as opposed to four years in high school or one year in preparatory school as opposed to three years before graduation in high school.

If the student, after graduation, goes to preparatory school his high school rank must be used. If he transfers before graduation he must have two years in the preparatory school in order to use the preparatory school rank in determining his prediction.

(Amendment No. 6 to proposed interpretation V-B was passed by voice vote.)

Thomas L. Jacobs (University of California, Los Angeles): In this part of the country most of the high schools do not calculate grade point averages. Furthermore, the pattern of admission for the University of California and other places does not take into account a number of high school grades. The grade point averages we use are those of the academic courses.

This presents very great difficulties in obtaining the certification, presumably for each student, that the high school does not have the rank in class; and secondly, many of the high schools do not provide the grade point average. We cannot get it from them.

This is legislation for a small part of the country and against a large part of the country.

Mr. Fuzak: May I respond that at the present time it is necessary to get either the grade point average or the rank.

Mr. Jacobs: It requires that you have a grade point average, but it doesn't say you have to have it calculated by the high school.

Willard F. Gray (University of Alabama): The rank is not available in most cases, but I agree to use the rank if it is available.

In a recent survey, 61 per cent of the students did not have high school rank on their transcripts. This is perhaps a Southeast problem. Seven states were covered, six of them in the Southeast and one in the Midwest. Only 39 per cent had rank available.

I realize that we may use a conversion table, but I fail to see the advantage in an artificial way of obtaining the grade point average.

The ones who would be penalized would be the nonscholarship athletes. The scholarship athletes would have to be identified soon enough to write and get the information, but the others would not.

Henry T. Bream (Gettysburg College): If a student goes to a preparatory school for one year, neither the grade point average nor his class standing in the preparatory school could be used; his prediction would be based on his high school record. Is that correct?

If that is true, it is very unfair. A boy who has good grades in preparatory school and is away from home spends more time with his studies and should not be penalized.

This is the fault I have opposed in the 1.600 legislation. It is not unusual for someone to be at the bottom of his class and not predict 1.600, but be an excellent student.

Mr. Fuzak: If he goes to a preparatory school his high school rank or grade point average must be used in predicting.

It was the thinking of the Academic Testing Committee that available to those students throughout practically all the country are the junior colleges, so that the door is not closed to the students.

(Amended proposal V-B was put to voice vote and defeated.)

Earl M. Ramer (University of Tennessee): The intent of Proposal V-C (pages C-6 and C-7) is to simplify the wording and to add to the phraseology "or reporting for uniformed squad practice." This is a proposed revision of O.I. 115 and I move its adoption. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

President Plant: I ask unanimous consent to consider Proposal V-E before we consider V-D because the terminology of V-D seems to assume that V-E has been adopted. (No objection was raised.)

Laurence C. Woodruff (University of Kansas): I move that Proposed Revision V-E (page C-7) to add OI 117 be approved. (The motion was seconded.)

I move that this proposal be amended as stipulated in Amendment No. 7 (page C-7) which adds this sentence: "The qualifying test score submitted by a prospect must represent the total score achieved from a single attempt on any nationally administered test date." (The motion was seconded.)

Thomas E. Geraghty (University of Chattanooga): Is that "for a prospect's prediction" not "or a prospect's prediction?"

Mr. Woodruff: I think not. Both are intended; the prospect's prediction and any acceptable table from the institution or from a conference.

Earl C. Lory (University of Montana): My institution requires all entering students to take the ACT test. We give it to all students who have not previously taken the test. It is approved by ACT, which gives the test, but we would not be able to use those scores under the wording of your OI. They are not on the nationally-approved date. However, they are approved tests.

Mr. Woodruff: Wouldn't it be true that any athletic award would be made before that date and therefore it would require the administration of the test at some earlier date?

Mr. Lory: It wouldn't be if we had a student of whom we were not aware at the time, who wanted to go into football. We wouldn't know about him until he showed up, and we could not establish his eligibility under the test at the national date.

Mr. Fuzak: I would like to point out there is another amendment which will follow this amendment, offered by the Big Ten. I think that would make some change in this motion without eliminating the date.

Mr. Lory: The Big Ten amendment would satisfy us, since we are the approved agency to give the tests.

Mr. Fuzak: If Amendment No. 7 is adopted can we amend it such as recommended in the Big Ten amendment (No. 8, pages C-7 and C-8)? If Amendment No. 7 is adopted, would this shut out the possibility of further amendment?

President Plant: The Parliamentary rules that Amendment No. 8 does not cancel the proposed amendment, but adds to it. (Amendment No. 7 was approved, 109 to 56.)

Mr. Fuzak: I would like to propose, in behalf of the Big Ten Conference, Amendment No. 8 (pages C-7 and C-8) which adds the words "or on a test available to prospective students generally which is administered on a college or university campus under the authority of the SAT or ACT services." (The motion was seconded.)

In spite of the fact that the testing services have indicated there are frequent administrations of their tests within a 75 mile radius of most areas and in some cases 55 miles, it has been the experience of schools in the Big Ten that the frequency of offering of the national tests and the convenience of location leaves something to be desired. There are certain months when the national tests are not offered, and there is also the problem of testing bureaus established on university campuses which administer the ACT and the SAT to other students which is discriminatory as far as athletes are concerned.

While our member institutions feel that this is an admirable correction, their conviction is that we are not yet ready for that step, and until such time as the national tests are offered far more frequently and in convenient locations, we should continue the possibility of administering tests on our campuses by those who have authority to do so from the ACT and SAT.

My personal experience is that my daughter in arranging to take the SAT found it to be possible to take it within a 150-mile radius in only one occasion in this academic year.

J. William Davis (Texas Technological College): Would this amendment in effect simply restore the old residual test?

President Plant: Mr. Fuzak indicates the answer is "Yes."

Mr. Davis: Wasn't the whole logic in the original proposal to get rid of this residual test?

Mr. Woodruff: The Committee on Academic Testing encountered a number of cases which appeared to be irregular, and our impression—from the authorities of both ACT and SAT—is that the tests are less secure under these circumstances and in most cases are not the same tests as are being administered by SAT and ACT to other students on the regularly set date.

Edward M. Bennett (Washington State University): In Washington, the testing services are divided essentially East and West; Washington west, and Washington State east. They are not able to take care of all the students at the time of the national administration date, so we have a large group that is tested at other times. They

have the same security on the test.

Mr. Lory: In Montana, we found 20 per cent of our incoming freshmen have not taken the test, although they have been written and told to take it at the national date when it is available. They have to go from 150 to 200 miles, and the students do not take them when they know they are available through our placement service. They are under the same security as the ACT because the university administers the test for the ACT on the regular testing date. They are identical tests, given under the same conditions, but they are given during freshman week by our regular testing service.

Mr. Fuzak: Many of the tests given in the testing bureau are the identical tests that are given on the national date.

However, I would like to point out something else which may be a mistaken impression. There was a further intention in this proposed official interpretation which states quite clearly that only the SAT and the ACT may be used in establishing an acceptable table. There has been a permissible approach to utilizing other tests. This is the critical element of this interpretation; the fact that only the ACT and SAT may be used to establish the prediction.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): I have never been able to fathom why there must be a single attempt by the student. I see no relationship between an English score and a mathematics score. Why not use his best English score, no matter when he takes it?

In our institution before this ruling came up, he had the privilege of taking the best English score and the best Math score.

(Amendment No. 8 was put to voice vote and carried.)

(Proposed interpretation V-E, as amended, was put to voice vote and passed.)

Alan J. Chapman (Rice University): Proposed interpretation V-D (page C-7) refers to what one does with students who have not had a prediction established before entering the institution.

The differences are these: The revision will require that the student be tested on the first national test date and the prediction established within two weeks following the receipt of scores from such test. Previously, the prediction had to be established within four weeks.

Under the new wording, the student must take only that one national test which first occurs after he first reports for practice and previously presumably any number of tests could be administered.

I move the adoption of this proposal. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Mr. Woodruff: Amendment No. 9 (page C-9) proposes new language which will be labeled OI 118. I represent the Council in presenting this and move for its adoption.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Recruiting—Use of Funds

Frank Carver (University of Pittsburgh): I move the adoption of Proposal VI-A (page C-8) which establishes OI 126.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Recruiting—Tryouts

Francis E. Smiley (Colorado School of Mines): I move the adoption of Proposal VII-A (page C-8). (The motion was seconded.)

Amendment No. 10 reads as follows: "No member of an institution's coaching staff may conduct or participate in any coaching school, clinic or sports training camp involving prospective students. For the purpose of this interpretation, a prospect shall be one who has **completed his junior year in high school.**" (Boldface indicates language changes.)

The purpose of the whole proposition is to include the clinic and sports training camps specifically in the category and to more closely define a prospect.

I move the amendment to the original proposition. (The motion to amend was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Max O. Schultze (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I move the adoption of Amendment No. 11 (page C-9) which has added a sentence to the effect that: "This shall not apply to activities sponsored or approved by this Association." (The motion was seconded.)

This is also related to summer sports programs for young people which are sponsored by the NCAA. The institutions which are actually implementing these plans may desire or may have to use personnel from other institutions in the vicinity or elsewhere, and it is essential that we provide some protection for members of the coaching staff of another institution or the instructional staff, so that they will not be in violation of the OI which prohibits participation of individuals from the coaching staffs of the various institutions in coaching schools or training camps.

Clarence Von Eschen (Beloit College): Is there a conflict between Amendment No. 10 and Amendment No. 11? Amendment No. 10 indicates the completion of the junior year, and Amendment No. 11 refers to academic study following completion of his sophomore year.

President Plant: The Chair's understanding was that Mr. Schultze's motion was only to add the words he stated to the amendment.

Mr. Schultze: That is correct.

Glenn J. Drahn (Coe College): I suggest that all of these amendments covering the staff members' participating in the camps are against their constitutional right to pursue a job. Many of our institutions hire on the nine-month or ten-month basis, and some of the people pick up these types of jobs as they are best qualified for this kind of employment. At least a couple of members of my staff would be hurt by this type of legislation. These are camps that have been established. We have them in Wisconsin, in Minnesota and in Illinois, and it would be unfair to these people to restrict them in this manner.

Herbert E. Glines (University of Bridgeport): As the previous speaker said, we are cutting into the livelihood of many of our members and it is important to them. Many of the boys who go to camp for special instruction are high school students. We have stopped juniors and seniors from going to them. We have turned that area of influence of our youth over to the pros. In our area, there are many professional camps, and if they cannot go to the camps run by our coaches they will go to the camps run by the professional people.

Many of the coaches do not operate the camp. They merely go and visit. If the coach comes to the camp for one week is he going

to know the boy is in the junior year or senior or sophomore year? It is going to be practically impossible to actually find out whether there is anybody working. It is not fair to the boy either. If the coach comes to the camp and the boy happens to be a junior, he then goes to the school the coach comes from, and is told he cannot participate, this would be unfair. You will have to warn every boy who goes to the camp, if he's a junior or senior.

This is not going to accomplish the result that is desired. A coach can go to any other camp, sit as a spectator and watch all the prospects he wants.

I went last summer to a football camp in New England, just to observe. It was run by two assistant coaches from two different schools. Every coach in New England was an instructor at a camp.

It was a tremendous experience for these young men. There are pictures being sent back home with the coach of Dartmouth and the coach of Army.

There are abuses, but why should we knock out the 97 per cent of good operations because there is three per cent abuse.

(Amendment No. 11 was put to voice vote and carried.)

(Proposal VII-A, as amended, was defeated, 57 to 127.)

Recruiting—Visitations

Frank R. Carver (University of Pittsburgh): I move the adoption of Proposal VIII-A (page C-9) which adds OI 152 for the purpose of clarification of a student's home.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Recruiting—Entertainment

Mr. Carver: In the interest of clarification, I move that Proposal IX-A (page C-9) be adopted.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Limitation on Playing Seasons

Mr. Carver: To clarify some of the questions concerning the pre-season conditioning program, I move that we adopt Proposal X-A (page C-9) which creates OI 178 as follows: "If one of the first three days of an institution's practice schedule includes a Sunday used for 'non-contact conditioning drills,' that Sunday may not be counted toward fulfillment of the mandatory three-day conditioning practice requirement; further, in determining the number of pre-season football 'practice opportunities,' Sunday is explicitly excluded from the counting."

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

12. OTHER PROPOSALS

Revisions in Executive Regulations

President Plant: I call your attention now to the Revisions in Executive Regulations (pages D-1 through D-4). The approval of these changes was included in the motion passed at the Opening Business Session accepting the report of the Executive Committee. The Chair will accept any questions, inquiries or discussion on any of those changes by the Executive Committee in the Executive Regulations. The Chair hears none.

Revisions in Recommended Policies and Practices

President Plant: In a motion accepting the Council's Report on Monday these were approved and they are now open for question, reconsideration and discussion. The Chair hears no inquiries.

Revision in Enforcement Procedure

President Plant: Your attention is directed to the proposed revision in the Enforcement Procedure (page F-1). The enforcement procedure makes reference to the taking of appropriate disciplinary action against the head coach of the sport involved. Last year after the Convention, I was invited to appear before the Football Coaches Association. This point was raised and they said this was a little bit offensive to them because it singled out the coach. This revision is intended to remedy any feeling of being singled out because the words added are, "and any other institutional employee if the circumstances warrant" and at the end a similar, "suspension or termination of the employment status of any other institutional employee who may be involved." That would include the director of athletics or faculty representative as well.

(The motion was regularly made and seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

Resolutions

Ernest McCoy (Pennsylvania State University): This resolution has been proposed by the NCAA Council.

"Whereas, The National Collegiate Athletic Association has supported the formation of the United States Wrestling Federation, and

"Whereas, The United States Wrestling Federation has been established as a democratic organization to provide opportunity for amateur athletes to compete with one another and to provide an opportunity for all groups fostering the promotion of amateur wrestling in the United States, and

"Whereas, The United States Wrestling Federation encompasses those wrestling interests which hold the key to the United States future in international competition, including the Olympics, and

"Whereas, The NCAA in previous conventions has pledged its support to various other sports federations of which this Association is a member, therefore, be it

"RESOLVED, By the NCAA in Convention assembled, that (1) the members of the Association reaffirm their support of the United States Wrestling Federation, and (2) the member institutions of this Association will continue to participate to the fullest extent possible in the programs of the United States Wrestling Federation, they will make every effort to provide coaching personnel and facilities for Federation activities, and they will assist in the Federation's development program in order to advance the sport of amateur wrestling in the United States."

I move the adoption of this resolution.

(The motion was seconded, put to vote and carried.)

J. William Davis (Texas Technological College): This is a request for permission, and I must ask for consent from the Parliamentarian,

to transfer four institutions, at their request, from District 3 to District 6.

The Southwestern Athletic Conference contains four schools in Texas, two in Mississippi and two in Louisiana. The ones outside of District Six would like to transfer into the district. I ask the unanimous consent of the Convention.

President Plant: The Parliamentarian has ruled that on a matter of this nature with unanimous consent such a motion may be approved. In the past in transferring we have had the notice circulated, but the nature of the motion is such that it is felt it can be waived if no one objects. Is there any objection? (No delegate opposed the motion.)

Mr. Davis: I move that Alcorn A&M College, Lorman, Mississippi; Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi; Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana, and Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, be transferred from District Three to District Six. (The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

13. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Cliff Speegle (Southwest Conference): In the absence of the Chairman, Neils Thompson, I submit the following report.

The recommendations of the Committee were given to each delegate as he entered the room.

(The members of the 1969 Committee on Committees may be found on page G-1. Following is a listing of new members appointed to each committee. A complete listing of all NCAA committees may be found on pages 83-95 of the 1969 NCAA Manual.)

Baseball Rules and Tournament: John Connelly, Northeastern University; Emory Bauer, Valparaiso University; Richard Siebert (secretary), University of Minnesota; Ervin Huether, South Dakota State University.

Baseball Tournament, College Division: Aldo A. Sebben, Southwest Missouri State College.

Basketball Rules: Richard Wilson, Amherst College; Paul Rundell, San Francisco State College.

Basketball Tournament, College Division: Howard C. Gentry, Tennessee A&I State University.

Basketball Tournament, University Division: Wiles Hallock, Western Athletic Conference.

Fencing Rules and Meet: Richard F. Oles, Johns Hopkins University.

Football Playoffs, College Division: Ernest C. Casale, Temple University.

Golf Tournament: Bruce Fossum, Michigan State University.

Gymnastics Rules and Meet: Gordon H. Chalmers, Indiana State University; Edward Gagnier, Iowa State University.

Ice Hockey Rules and Tournament: John McComb, Ohio University.

Lacrosse Rules: Ferris Thomsen, Jr., Denison University.

Skiing Rules and Meet: Ward Wells, University of Minnesota, Duluth; Bob Beck, Montana State University; John Cress, University of Wyoming.

Soccer Rules and Tournament: Roy Skinner, Duke University;

Alan King, Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

Swimming Rules and Meet: Tom Stubbs, Bowling Green State University; Art Solow, Colorado State University; Dave Eavenson, Dickinson College; Walt Hanson, San Francisco State College.

Tennis Tournament: Clarence Mabry, Trinity (Tex.) University.

Track and Field Rules and Meet: George Dales, Western Michigan University.

Wrestling Rules and Tournament: Lowell Lange, Georgia Institute of Technology; Myron Roderick, Oklahoma State University; Harlan Swanson, New Mexico State University; Jim Smith, University of Washington.

College: Stan Marshall, South Dakota State University; Vannette W. Johnson, Arkansas AM&N University; Clarence Kellogg, Regis College; Richard Koenig, Valparaiso University.

Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports: Ernest Jokl, University of Kentucky.

Extra Events: Wade Stinson, University of Kansas.

Olympic: Claude R. Gilstrap, University of Texas, Arlington; Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University.

The Committee on Committees during its deliberations became most concerned over the length of terms of appointments of members of certain committees. In a number of cases these terms seem to the Committee to be too long and are not appropriate under present-day conditions; therefore, the Committee on Committees recommends that the Council charge an appropriate committee with the responsibility for restudying the terms of appointment for members of standing committees.

President Plant: The Chair will consider this is in the form of a motion to accept the report of the Committee on Committees.
(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

14. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Adolph W. Samborski (Harvard University): Before giving the report of the Nominating Committee, I have a very pleasant function to perform on behalf of the Association and that is to present to our President and Secretary-Treasurer mementos of our appreciation of their outstanding service to this Association during their two years in office.

(Presentations were made to President Plant and Secretary-Treasurer Ernest McCoy and the assembly rose and applauded.)

Now I have the honor to present the selections of the Nominating Committee for the positions of President of the Association, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, Vice-Presidents of District 2, District 4, District 6, District 8 and for three Council members-at-large. The selections of the Nominating Committee are as follows:

For President: Harry M. Cross, University of Washington.

For Secretary-Treasurer: William J. Flynn, Boston College.

For Vice-Presidents: District 2—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University; District 4—James R. McCoy, Ohio State University; District 6—J. William Davis, Texas Technological College; District 8—Raymond T. Ellickson, University of Oregon.

Members-at-Large: Frank Carver, University of Pittsburgh; Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University; Dwight T. Reed, Lincoln (Mo.) University.

(A complete listing of the Council may be found on pages 5 and 6.)

President Plant: I will accept that as a motion to accept the report and elect the nominees to office.

(The motion was seconded, put to voice vote and carried.)

(The audience rose and applauded as President-Elect Cross was escorted to the platform.)

Before I turn the gavel over to you, Harry, I just want to say one or two things. You have a busy year ahead of you, but it will be one of the greatest years of your life, and you will get your greatest thrill out of the cooperation of these gentlemen who are ready, willing and able. They have one quality that is worth knowing. They do not expect you to be perfect. It is evident perhaps by some of the vote announcements this afternoon. They have a large measure of a quality that was well put by the immortal Dante when he said, "The Good Lord has a special leniency for those who sin with a warm heart."

Harry, congratulations!

(President Cross then assumed the chair.)

President Cross: I feel honored to be elected. I shall do the best I can. I shall be diligent. Whether I will be effective you will know more about later.

I hope I have the good fortune of the effective assistance I have had in the last two years as parliamentarian, because there has been a skilled parliamentarian ahead of me and I didn't have to worry very much.

Bill, I think you should speak, too.

William J. Flynn (Boston University): I feel thrilled and honored to be elected to this position. I realize I have great big shoes to fill—Fran Smiley's and Ernie McCoy's—but I will do my best. Thank you. (Applause)

President Cross: If we can be as effective as our predecessors, I am sure we will have a successful year.

(The Convention adjourned at 4:35 p.m.)

Appendix A

Report of the Treasurer

The accounts of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, set forth on the following pages, were audited by the Francis A. Wright Company, a firm of accountants and auditors located in Kansas City, Missouri. The Company's report, signed by Ralph E. Bostwick, CPA, included the following exhibits and schedules which "fairly reflect the financial position of the National Collegiate Athletic Association on August 31, 1968, and the income and expense of that organization for the fiscal year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted principles of accounting applied on a basis consistent with that of preceding years."—Ernest B. McCoy, NCAA Secretary-Treasurer.

ASSETS			
	Year Ended August 31		
	1968	1967	
Current Assets:			
Cash on hand and in banks	\$ 484,840.43	\$ 478,310.59	
Accounts receivable—trade	48,754.69	46,339.89	
Interest receivable	515.00	530.00	
Inventories	23,792.99	19,936.90	
Television program expense paid in advance	13,044.38	21,666.73	
Prepaid expense	7,265.24	6,667.15	
Total Current Assets	578,212.73	573,451.26	
Deferred Charges:			
Advanced against future commitments..		3,500.00	
Investments:			
Advisory Investment Trust—1 (Schedule 1)	233,107.67	232,853.44	
Investment in United States bonds	100,531.25	100,531.25	
Advisory Investment Trust—A (Schedule 2)	166,545.71	53,000.00	
Funded Cash Reserve (Schedule 3)	90,343.54	192,237.43	
Scholarship Foundation Trust	1,000.00	1,000.00	
Total Investments	591,528.17	579,622.12	
	Accumu- lated Cost Depre- ciation	Cost Less Depre- ciation	
Fixed Assets:			
Furniture and fixtures .. \$88,104.15	\$37,366.04	\$50,738.11	

Leasehold improve- ments ...	4,945.64	1,475.42	3,470.22		
	\$93,049.79	\$38,841.46	\$54,208.33		
Cost of Fixed Assets less Accumu- lated Depreciation	54,208.33	30,350.74			
Other Assets:					
Unamortized advance (CAPS)	425.00	2,500.00			
Travel deposits	425.00	425.00			
Total Other Assets	425.00	2,925.00			
Total Assets	\$1,224,374.23	\$1,189,849.12			
LIABILITIES, RESERVES AND SURPLUS					
	Year Ended August 31				
	1968	1967			
Current Liabilities:					
Accounts payable	\$ 9,157.79	\$ 174.24			
Olympic contributions		1,055.00			
Due participating colleges from meets and tournaments	817.36	3,481.93			
Payroll taxes withheld	5,421.17	4,128.72			
Total Current Liabilities	15,396.32	8,839.89			
Deferred Income:					
Publications	6,094.66	3,546.68			
Dues	175.00	725.00			
Total Deferred Income	6,269.66	4,271.68			
Reserves:					
Advisory Investment Trust—1 (Schedule 1)	233,107.67	232,853.44			
Investment in United States bonds	100,531.25	100,531.25			
Advisory Investment Trust—A (Schedule 2)	166,545.71	67,261.20			
Funded Cash	89,937.50*	193,498.65			
Championship Events:					
Baseball	12,657.54	14,221.11			
College Division Football..	63,777.24	64,364.47			
College World Series					
Contract	10,000.00	10,000.00			
Gymnastics	3,403.80	3,425.91			
Ice Hockey	16,512.68	16,512.68			
Indoor Track and Field	15,920.86	15,920.86			
Outdoor Track and Field...	4,526.34	5,074.08			
Swimming	4,601.57	4,601.57			
Wrestling	6,843.84	6,843.84			
Other NCAA Events	22,642.65	160,886.52			

*The difference between this amount and the related Funded Cash Reserve (Schedule 3) is represented by investment income included in Surplus.

Miscellaneous:

Academic Testing and Requirements	8,149.12		2,520.75
Advancement of Intercollegiate Football ..	86,860.73		104,660.66
Awards	1,364.16		1,587.18
College Division	36,255.75		40,123.40
Committee on Infractions ..	10,000.00		
Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports ..	20,395.63		18,163.93
Grants to affiliates	20,700.00		
Legal	26,342.02		23,263.58
Media Seminar	6,119.13		5,641.52
Postgraduate Scholarships ..	41,536.02		44,862.05
Promotion of Indoor Track ..	15,000.00		5,000.00
Special Committees	12,608.62		14,443.24
Special Track Committee ..	861.33		10,000.00
USCSC Membership	14,482.96	300,675.47	15,000.00
Total Reserves	1,051,684.12		1,040,375.37
Surplus (Schedule 4)	151,024.13		136,362.18
Total Liabilities, Reserves and Surplus	\$1,224,374.23		\$1,189,849.12

ADVISORY INVESTMENT TRUST ACCOUNT—1

August 31, 1968

(Schedule 1)

United States Government Securities (at cost):

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value	Market Value	Cost
U.S. Treasury notes	8-15-69	6%	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 5,026.56	\$ 5,039.06
bonds	2-15-80	4%	5,000.00)		4,950.00
bonds	2-15-80	4%	4,000.00)	7,942.50	3,940.00
bonds	5-15-85	4¼%	10,000.00)		10,000.00
bonds	5-15-85/75	4¼%	10,000.00)	17,587.50	10,037.50
			\$ 34,000.00	30,556.56	33,966.56

Corporation Stocks (at cost):

	Number of Shares	Class		
American Telephone and Telegraph Co.	200	Capital	10,650.00	9,247.63
E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.	45	Common	7,610.63	5,891.66
Diebold, Inc.	200	Common	8,100.00	6,256.44
General Electric Co.	100	Common	8,525.00	8,852.88
General Motors Co.	33	Common	2,772.00	2,464.88
B. F. Goodrich Co.	150	Common	6,562.50	7,194.63

A-3

Houston Lighting & Power Co.	100	Common	4,300.00	5,194.15
Illinois Power Co.	200	Common	7,725.00	7,550.38
Indianapolis Power and Light Co.	100	Common	2,912.50	3,486.25
International Business Machines Co.	64	Common	20,928.00	9,763.22
Johns Manville Corp.	50	Common	3,900.00	3,006.88
Monsanto Chemical Co.	116	Common	6,321.88	4,786.79
Northern States Power Co.	200	Common	6,000.00	4,811.50
Northwest Airlines	100	Common	8,275.00	7,421.38
Pepsico, Inc.	200	Common	9,600.00	8,480.00
Phillips Petroleum Co.	100	Common	6,925.00	5,582.04
Pitney-Bowes, Inc.	100	Common	6,887.50	4,315.38
G. D. Searle and Co.	100	Common	4,050.00	3,574.19
Texaco, Inc.	109	Capital	9,156.00	4,291.28
			141,201.01	112,171.56

Corporation Bonds (at cost):

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value		
John Deere and Co.	10-31-86	4½%	\$10,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 9,925.00
Illinois Central Equip. Co. . .	2- 1-72	4½%	5,000.00	4,600.00	4,874.07
Louisville & Nashville Railroad Equip. Trust	1- 1-69	4½%	5,000.00	4,950.00	4,941.73
	6-15-78	5¼%	15,000.00	13,500.00	14,738.40
Seaboard Airline Railroad ...					
Equip. Trust	3- 1-75	5¾%	10,000.00	9,400.00	9,947.70
Southern Pacific Equip. Trust	11-1-73	4¾%	10,000.00	9,300.00	10,340.00
			\$55,000.00	49,750.00	54,766.90

Other Securities (at cost):

Farmers Home Administration Notes	6- 3-91	5.4%	\$24,879.58	24,665.56	24,665.56
---	---------	------	-------------	-----------	-----------

Other:

Principal Balance—Cash	7,537.09	7,537.09
------------------------------	----------	----------

Total Advisory Investment Trust Account—1	\$253,710.22	\$233,107.67
---	--------------	--------------

A-4

ADVISORY INVESTMENT TRUST ACCOUNT—A

August 31, 1968

(Schedule 2)

United States Government Securities (at cost):

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value	Par or Market Value	Cost
U.S. Treas.					
Notes	5-15-71	5¼ %	\$ 23,000.00	\$ 23,000.00	\$ 22,755.00
Notes	11-15-70	5 %	10,000.00	10,000.00	9,862.00
			<u>\$ 33,000.00</u>	<u>33,000.00</u>	<u>32,617.00</u>

Corporation Stocks (at cost):

	Number of Shares	Class		
General Telephone & Electronics Corp.	120	Common	4,725.00	5,017.59
Illinois Power Company ...	100	Common	3,725.00	3,837.50
International Nickel Co. of Canada, Ltd.	125	Common	4,813.00	5,223.04
National Cash Register Co...	28	Common	3,542.00	3,795.88
J. C. Penney Company	80	Common	6,690.00	5,019.69
Scott Paper Company	175	Common	5,031.00	4,999.56
Tampa Electric Company ..	150	Common	4,125.00	4,212.20
Texaco, Inc.	70	Common	5,609.00	5,284.75
			<u>38,260.00</u>	<u>37,390.21</u>

Corporate Bonds (at cost):

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value		
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.	5- 1-90	5 %	\$ 15,000.00	15,000.00	12,918.75
Public Service of Colorado	10- 1-91	4½ %	15,000.00	15,000.00	11,868.75
Sears, Roebuck and Company	8- 1-83	4¾ %	35,000.00	35,000.00	30,597.25
Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey	7-15-98	6½ %	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
			<u>\$ 75,000.00</u>	<u>75,000.00</u>	<u>65,384.75</u>

Financial Stocks (at cost):

	Number of Shares		
First National Bank of Atlanta	50	3,050.00	2,725.00
First National Bank of New York	50	3,656.00	2,868.75
		<u>6,706.00</u>	<u>5,593.75</u>

A-5

Federal Agency Securities:

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value		
Federal National Mortgage Ass'n.	4- 8-88	6.45 %	\$ 25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00
Principal Balance—Cash				560.00	560.00
Total Advisory Investment Account—A			<u>\$178,526.00</u>	<u>\$166,545.71</u>	

FUNDED CASH RESERVE

August 31, 1968

(Schedule 3)

	Cost
Savings Accounts:	
City National Bank and Trust Company	\$10,000.00
Commerce Trust Company	10,406.04
California Savings and Loan Association	10,000.00
Lincoln Savings Association	10,000.00
Security Savings and Loan Association	10,000.00
Swedish American Savings and Loan Association	10,000.00
Total Savings Accounts	<u>60,406.04</u>

United States Government Securities:

	Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Maturity Value	Market Value
U.S. Treas. Bonds. .10- 1-69	4.0 %	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 4,911.50	\$ 4,937.50
Federal Land Banks Consolidated Federal Farm Loan Bonds 2-20-70	5½ %	25,000.00	24,750.00	25,000.00
		<u>\$30,000.00</u>	<u>\$29,661.50</u>	<u>29,937.50</u>
Total Funded Cash Reserve			<u>\$90,343.54</u>	

ANALYSIS OF SURPLUS

For the Fiscal Year Ended August 31, 1968

(Schedule 4)

Balance September 1, 1967	\$136,362.18
Additions:	
General Income (Schedule 5)	\$564,259.84
Less: General Expense (Schedule 6) ...	410,794.34
	153,465.50
Adjustment to Funded Cash Reserve	3,928.06
National Collegiate Sports Services Furniture and fixtures	21,099.29
National Collegiate Sports Services Net Loss (Schedule 8)	(2,669.36)
College Athletics Publishing Service	
Net Income (Schedule 9)	9,580.27

A-6

College Athletics Publishing Service	
Increase in equity	4,466.48

189,870.24

Deductions:

Transfers to Special Reserves:

Media Seminar	\$ 6,500.00
Legal	35,000.00
Special Reserve	38,863.82
Sports Injuries and Safety...	8,000.00
Special Committees	5,000.00
Committee on Academic Testing	7,000.00
Committee on Infractions...	10,000.00
Other Events	4,000.00
U.S. Collegiate Sports Council	7,500.00
Grants to affiliates	20,700.00
Indoor Track Promotion...	10,000.00
	<u>152,563.82</u>

Transfers to Committees and Contingencies:

Olympic Basketball...	\$6,872.70
Golf and Tennis....	2,264.05
College Basketball..	502.80
Television Assessments	1,904.05
Survey No. 3.....	5,428.15
	<u>16,971.75</u>
Special Council meeting.....	4,926.46
Payments for appreciation plaques, silver bowls, etc....	<u>746.26</u>

Total Deductions	175,208.29	14,661.95
Balance	<u>\$151,024.13</u>	

GENERAL INCOME (Schedule 5)

	Year Ended August 31 1968	1967
Membership Dues	\$ 65,975.00	\$ 63,887.50
Meets and Tournaments:		
University Basketball	355,376.25	330,112.63
Baseball	11,460.74	11,833.89
Indoor Track	10,219.62	14,749.81
Wrestling	17,880.50	10,070.41
Swimming	489.02	6,882.50
Soccer	446.15	

A-7

Track and Field	4,903.22	
Ice Hockey	259.15	15,314.47
College Basketball	32,212.89	15,646.57
	<u>433,247.54</u>	<u>404,610.28</u>

Royalties and Other:

Administrative fee—Television assessments	22,500.00	34,000.00
Spencer Advertising Company.....	5,000.00	5,000.00
Registration fees	2,040.00	1,975.00
Football program feature service	230.00	348.60
Sundry	1,464.71	1,944.67
Film service	3,664.28	
	<u>34,948.99</u>	<u>43,268.27</u>

Investment Income	30,088.31	29,890.98
-------------------------	-----------	-----------

Total General Income	<u>\$564,259.84</u>	<u>\$541,657.03</u>
----------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

GENERAL EXPENSE (Schedule 6)

Year Ended August 31
1968 1967

Rules Committee Meetings:

Football	\$ 6,158.49	\$ 4,541.31
Basketball	2,958.85	2,892.80
Swimming	3,754.87	3,071.44
Wrestling	3,987.56	3,660.95
Track and Field	3,532.25	2,981.08
Baseball	2,427.22	2,238.31
Gymnastics	1,196.39	1,809.49
Ice Hockey	1,253.80	1,087.42
Skiing	1,429.30	1,325.18
Soccer	1,183.19	2,053.59
Fencing	1,142.65	1,042.59
Lacrosse	336.08	413.84
	<u>29,360.65</u>	<u>27,118.00</u>

Other Committee Meetings:

Council	10,019.29	8,962.66
Infractions	13,297.28	10,935.51
Executive	5,839.53	4,562.41
Special	4,218.27	7,388.24
Public Relations	3,734.30	2,191.02
College	1,659.16	3,616.17
Extra Events	971.79	572.62
	<u>39,739.62</u>	<u>38,228.63</u>

Meets and Tournaments:

Insurance	5,535.00	6,143.00
-----------------	----------	----------

A-8

Indoor Track	1,013.24	642.81
Soccer	446.15	
	<u>6,994.39</u>	<u>6,785.81</u>
Miscellaneous:		
Annual Convention	17,183.63	12,258.70
Secretary's Expense Rules Committee	6,142.98	4,617.05
Grants:		
National Collegiate Sports Services	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 51,000.00
National Association of Basketball Coaches	3,000.00	3,000.00
Track and field statistics	1,500.00	1,701.63
Miscellaneous	350.00	150.00
	<u>40,850.00</u>	<u>55,851.63</u>

General Administrative:

Salaries	146,627.78	139,079.35
Printing and duplicating	40,414.11	25,146.68
Rent	16,337.37	15,471.76
Annuity and insurance	16,753.60	15,604.89
Telephone and telegraph	8,232.20	8,556.04
Postage and express	8,687.18	7,873.49
Office supplies and expense	7,521.85	6,776.58
Director and staff expense	7,054.61	6,380.98
Payroll taxes	4,357.72	3,910.60
Depreciation	3,511.83	3,025.63
Membership dues	2,557.00	2,469.00
Contingency	2,260.58	1,547.32
Legal	2,400.00	1,525.00
Office equipment repairs	1,207.27	1,150.67
Subscriptions	457.44	453.25
Officers' expense	655.62	
Miscellaneous	1,486.91	1,455.49
	<u>270,523.07</u>	<u>240,426.73</u>
Total General Expense	<u>\$410,794.34</u>	<u>\$385,286.55</u>

TELEVISION INCOME AND EXPENSE

(Schedule 7)

	Year Ended August 31	
	1968	1967
Income:		
Assessments	\$350,654.07	\$310,000.00
Expense:		
Salary—program director	6,999.72	6,999.72
Publicity and public relations	6,149.97	6,896.70
Committee meeting expense	19,202.97	20,569.83
NCAA operating expense and assessments	18,500.00	15,000.00
Attendance statistics and analysis	10,000.00	10,000.00

Legal fees	8,000.00	8,000.00
Grant to Football Rules Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Telephone and telegraph	3,714.35	4,219.25
Miscellaneous		2,500.00
Printing and duplicating	3,042.05	2,252.95
Secretarial assistance	1,272.50	945.33
Special travel and entertainment	1,250.24	2,953.30
Postage	73.25	827.72
Office expense	199.02	99.89
Total Expense	<u>82,404.07</u>	<u>85,264.69</u>
Excess of Assessments over Expenses	<u>268,250.00</u>	<u>224,735.31</u>

Less Transfers to Reserve Funds:

Special Reserve	91,500.00	85,000.00
Postgraduate Scholarships	75,000.00	75,000.00
College Football Promotion	16,750.00	64,000.00
National Collegiate Sports Services	80,000.00	
Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports	5,000.00	
Total Transfers	<u>268,250.00</u>	<u>224,000.00</u>
Net Income	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$ 735.31</u>

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE SPORTS SERVICES
STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE
(Schedule 8)

	Year Ended August 31	
	1968	1967
Income:		
Grant from NCAA Operating Budget ..	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 51,000.00
Grant from NCAA television	90,000.00	10,000.00
Schedules and publishers service	3,070.00	3,304.70
Statistical service	3,613.76	4,256.49
Printed forms	2,891.33	3,370.22
Statistical subscriptions	3,623.50	4,195.80
Basketball score service	7,479.59	10,168.39
Fee from College Athletics		
Publishing Service	10,500.00	10,000.00
Total Income	<u>157,178.18</u>	<u>96,295.60</u>
Expense:		
Salaries	88,968.13	53,480.34
Rent	13,581.40	5,566.55
Utilities	1,461.94	392.75
Telephone and telegraph	7,238.24	5,301.09
Office supplies	1,850.26	1,310.16
Office equipment repairs	191.38	296.65
Postage and mailing	9,631.91	9,342.75
Printing and duplicating	14,914.79	12,223.46

IBM tabulating	7,381.80	6,311.54
Travel	1,569.70	707.33
Newspaper subscriptions	403.43	
Meetings and entertainment		371.92
Professional services	400.00	400.00
Insurance	6,468.76	4,646.93
Payroll taxes	2,551.71	1,558.60
Contingency	501.16	303.74
Miscellaneous	215.72	301.00
Depreciation	2,517.19	1,462.22
Total Expense	159,847.54	103,977.03
Net Income or (Loss)	(\$ 2,669.36)	(\$ 7,681.43)

COLLEGE ATHLETICS PUBLISHING SERVICE
STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE
(Schedule 9)

	Year Ended August 31	
	1968	1967
Income:		
Book sales	\$159,010.47	\$141,700.28
Advertising revenue	10,494.05	10,589.55
News stand and special edition sales	4,775.75	8,984.53
Miscellaneous income		247.00
Add: Back transfer of NCAA income		4,500.00
Total Income	174,280.27	166,021.36
Expense:		
Guide manufacturing	51,632.43	48,519.43
Guide editing	3,065.82	2,501.24
Guide transportation	13,352.99	9,776.64
Guide promotion	5,899.68	5,138.91
Guide miscellaneous	8.32	116.22
Fee to National Collegiate Sports Services	10,500.00	10,000.00
Salaries	54,904.84	49,745.73
Rent	3,908.76	4,083.78
Utilities		145.95
Telephone and telegraph	1,318.26	1,642.56
Office supplies	1,448.54	981.02
Office equipment repairs	332.40	382.11
Postage and mailing	3,366.99	2,825.13
Printing and duplicating	1,830.07	2,340.50
Travel		351.40
Meetings and entertainment	996.18	648.88
Professional services	400.00	400.00
Insurance	5,120.27	4,953.07

Payroll taxes	1,539.30	1,289.18
Contingency	1,075.54	314.62
Miscellaneous	184.57	122.52
Amortization of leasehold improvements	498.00	139.10
Depreciation	217.04	79.35
Promotion		600.00
Auto allowance	600.00	600.00
Fee to NCAA		4,500.00
Amortization of publication loan	2,500.00	2,500.00
Total Expense	164,700.00	154,697.34
Net Income	\$ 9,580.27	\$ 11,324.02

Appendix B

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[NOTE: In the following proposed amendments, those letters and words which appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words which appear in **bold face** are to be added. All amendments shall be effective upon adoption unless otherwise indicated. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1968 NCAA Manual.]

I. PRINCIPLE OF AMATEURISM

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1, page 4, as follows:

"An amateur student-athlete is one who engages in athletics for the physical, mental, social and educational benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom athletics is an avocation. One who takes or has taken pay, or has accepted the promise of pay, in any form, for participation in athletics, **or has entered into an agreement of any kind to compete in professional athletics or to negotiate a professional sports contract**, or has directly or indirectly used his skill for pay in any form shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics, it being understood that a student-athlete may accept scholarships or educational grants-in-aid from his institution provided such aid is not in conflict with the governing legislation of this Association."

[NOTE: This contemplates revisions of O.I. 11 and O.I. 12.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To reinforce by legislative action previously approved interpretations.

II. PRINCIPLE OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9, page 5, by lettering the first paragraph as (a), and adding paragraph (b) as follows:

"(b) **Member institutions shall not schedule intercollegiate athletic contests in conjunction with professional sports contests or exhibitions.**"

Source: NCAA Professional Relations Committee; NCAA Council.

Intent: To prevent college athletic teams from appearing in double-header programs (or similar presentations) with professional teams.

III. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING ELIGIBILITY

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 10, page 7, by addition of the following:

"(f) **He must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have**

elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution; except that this provision shall not apply if he is a graduate of a junior college, or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 3.000, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500 provided he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national experience tables at the time of his graduation from high school.

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at any four-year college must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution unless he has completed a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six (36) quarter hours at, and also has graduated from the junior college, or is readmitted to the four-year college first attended.

"(2) A student who transfers from a collegiate institution while he is disqualified or suspended for academic or disciplinary reasons must complete two calendar years of residence at the certifying institution.

"The foregoing residence requirements shall not apply to participation on junior varsity teams."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require member institutions to observe the basic transfer requirements of Bylaw 4-1-(d) for all intercollegiate varsity competition (junior varsity participation excluded).

No. 1. Amend amendment III-A by deleting the last sentence:

"*The foregoing residence requirements shall not apply to participation on junior varsity teams.*"

Source: Pacific-8 Conference.

IV. ELIGIBILITY RULES FOR NCAA EVENTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1 and 2 as follows:

1. Amend Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution for the purposes of eligibility only in the sports of football and basketball; or he must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that if he is a graduate of a junior college or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable

degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college, this provision shall not apply."

[NOTE: Sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

2. Amend Section 1-(e), page 36, as follows:

"(e) He must not previously have engaged in *four three* seasons of varsity competition in the sport involved *except for football and basketball in which sports he must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition*, it being understood that:"

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Participation by a freshman on a varsity team must be charged as a season of varsity competition and must be counted as one of the *three* seasons of varsity competition referred to above, except that participation by a freshman on the varsity football or basketball team of a junior college or of an institution with an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250 shall not be counted as a season of varsity competition. Freshmen are not eligible for NCAA-sponsored events. *in football or basketball unless they qualify under Section 2.*"

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (3) unchanged.]

3. Amend Section 2, page 37, as follows:

"The following exceptions to Section 1 are granted in connection with NCAA-sponsored College Division events:

"(a) Freshmen who are otherwise eligible may be permitted to compete in College Division football and basketball events provided their institution has an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250. Such freshmen are eligible for three additional seasons of varsity competition insofar as participation in these events is concerned.

"(b) Freshmen who compete on the varsity football and basketball teams of College Division institutions which have an undergraduate male enrollment of 1250 or more are ineligible for College Division football and basketball events as freshmen; however they are eligible for three additional seasons of competition in such College Division events."

Source: Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Intent: To make freshmen ineligible for all NCAA events and to count participation by a freshman on a varsity team as one of three permissible seasons of varsity competition.

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Sections 1 and 2, as follows:

1. Amend Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution for the purposes of eligibility only in the sports of football and basketball; or he must have completed

one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that if he is a graduate of a junior college or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college, this provision shall not apply."

[NOTE: Sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

2. Amend Section 1-(e), page 36, as follows:

"(e) He must not previously have engaged in *four three* seasons of varsity competition in the sport involved *except for football and basketball in which sports he must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition*, it being understood that:"

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Participation by a freshman on a varsity team must be charged as a season of varsity competition and must be counted as one of the *three* seasons of varsity competition referred to above, except that participation by a freshman on the varsity football or basketball team of a junior college or of an institution with an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250 shall not be counted as a season of varsity competition for purposes of paragraph (e); however, freshmen are not eligible for NCAA-sponsored events in football or basketball unless they qualify under Section 2."

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (3) unchanged.]

3. Amend Section 2, page 37, as follows:

"The following exceptions to Section 1 are granted in connection with NCAA-sponsored College Division events:

"(a) Freshmen who are otherwise eligible may be permitted to compete in College Division football and basketball events provided their institution has an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250. Such freshmen are eligible for three additional seasons of varsity competition insofar as participation in these events is concerned.

"(b) Freshmen who compete on the varsity football and basketball teams of College Division institutions which have an undergraduate male enrollment of 1250 or more are ineligible for College Division football and basketball events as freshmen; however, they are eligible for three additional seasons of competition in such College Division events."

Source: Eastern College Athletic Conference, Big Ten Conference, Pacific-8 Conference.

Intent: To rule freshman students from institutions with more than 1250 undergraduate male students ineligible for all NCAA

events, and freshman students from all institutions ineligible for National Collegiate Championship events.

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Sections 1 and 2 as follows:

1. Amend Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution *for the purposes of eligibility only in the sports of football and basketball*; or he must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that if he is a graduate of a junior college or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college, this provision shall not apply."

[NOTE: Sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

2. Amend Section 1-(e), page 36, as follows:

"(e) He must not previously have engaged in *four three* seasons of varsity competition in the sport involved *except for football and basketball in which sports he must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition*, it being understood that:"

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Participation by a freshman on a varsity team must be charged as a season of varsity competition and must be counted as one of the seasons of varsity competition referred to above, except that participation by a freshman on the varsity *football or basketball* team of a junior college or of an institution **which has declared College Division under the provisions of Bylaw 4-6-(a) with an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250** shall not be counted as a season of varsity competition. Freshmen are not eligible for NCAA-sponsored events in football or basketball unless they qualify under Section 2."

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (3) unchanged.]

3. Amend Section 2, page 37, as follows:

"The following exceptions to Section 1 are granted in connection with NCAA-sponsored College Division events:

"(a) Freshmen who are otherwise eligible may be permitted to compete in College Division football and basketball events *provided their institution has an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250*. Such freshmen are eligible for three additional seasons of varsity competition insofar as participation in these events is concerned.

"(b) Freshmen who compete on the varsity football and bas-

ketball teams of College Division institutions which have an undergraduate male enrollment of 1250 or more are ineligible for College Division football and basketball events as freshmen; however, they are eligible for three additional seasons of competition in such College Division events."

Source: Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Intent: To make freshmen eligible for all College Division events, but not University Division events; such freshmen would be eligible for three subsequent seasons of participation in both divisions.

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution *for the purposes of eligibility only in the sports of football and basketball*; or he must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that if he is a graduate of a junior college or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college, this provision shall not apply."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To rule freshmen ineligible for NCAA events except for the existing College Division exceptions in Bylaw 4-2, but allow freshmen who compete on varsity teams three additional years of eligibility for all NCAA events except those in football and basketball; effective date: September 1, 1969.

E. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Sections 1 and 2 as follows:

1. Amend Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) *He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution for the purposes of eligibility only in the sports of football and basketball*; or He must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution, except that if he is a graduate of a junior college or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college, this provision shall not apply."

[NOTE: Sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

2. Amend Section 1-(e), page 36, as follows:

"(e) He must not previously have engaged in four seasons of varsity competition in the sport involved *except for football and basketball in which sports he must not previously have engaged in three seasons of varsity competition, it being understood that:*"

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) Participation by a freshman on a varsity team must be charged as a season of varsity competition and must be counted as one of the seasons of varsity competition referred to above, *except that participation by a freshman on the varsity football or basketball team of a junior college or of an institution with an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250 shall not be counted as a season of varsity competition. Freshmen are not eligible for NCAA-sponsored events in football or basketball unless they qualify under Section 2.*"

[NOTE: Sub-paragraph (3) unchanged.]

3. Amend Section 2, page 37, as follows:

"The following exceptions to Section 1 are granted in connection with NCAA-sponsored College Division Events:

"(a) Freshmen who are otherwise eligible may be permitted to compete in College Division football and basketball events *provided their institution has an undergraduate male enrollment of less than 1250. Such freshmen are eligible for three additional seasons of varsity competition insofar as participation in these events is concerned.*

"(b) *Freshmen who compete on the varsity football and basketball teams of College Division institutions which have an undergraduate male enrollment of 1250 or more are ineligible for College Division football and basketball events as freshmen; however, they are eligible for three additional seasons of competition in such College Division events.*"

Source: Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Intent: To make freshmen eligible for all NCAA events in all sports.

F. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 36, as follows:

"(d) He must have completed a full freshman year of two full semesters or three full quarters or one academic year as defined by the certifying institution for the purposes of eligibility only in the sports of football and basketball; or he must have completed one full year of two full semesters or three full quarters and one calendar year must have elapsed from his first registration at the certifying institution after transfer from another collegiate institution; except that **this provision shall not apply** if he is a graduate of a junior college, or presents a minimum of forty-eight (48) semester hours or a minimum of seventy-two (72) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college, or presents a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 'B' average from a junior college, **or presents a min-**

imum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit from a junior college with an accumulative minimum grade point average of 2.500 provided he predicted a minimum grade point average of 1.600 or better on the NCAA national experience tables at the time of his graduation from high school this provision shall not apply."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To rule students transferring from junior colleges immediately eligible for NCAA events, provided they have attained a minimum 2.500 grade point average and predicted 1.600 on the NCAA national experience tables upon graduation from high school.

G. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d)-(1), page 36, as follows:

"(1) A student who transfers from a junior college after attendance at any four-year college must complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution unless he has completed a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or a minimum of thirty-six (36) quarter hours at the junior college **following his transfer from the four-year college**, and also has graduated from the junior college, or is readmitted to the four-year college first attended."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require a multiple-transfer student to attend the junior college a full academic year as defined, as well as graduate from the junior college, to be immediately eligible at the certifying institution.

H. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 36, by the addition of the following:

"(3) An alien student who is required to transfer one or more times because of a study program predetermined by his government or the sponsoring educational organization shall be exempt from the one calendar year residence requirement of paragraph (d)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide exception to transfer rule for the special case indicated.

I. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(d), page 36, by the addition of the following:

"(3) A student who is admitted with a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of advanced placement from a CEEB examination (or from a similar proficiency examination) and/or concurrent high school-college credit without previous enrollment at a collegiate institution shall be immediately eligible for NCAA events in all sports. Credits earned from extension or summer session courses may not be counted in satisfaction of this requirement."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To render immediately eligible students who are admitted to advanced standing.

V. NCAA ATHLETIC EVENTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a), page 40, and Article 3, Section 2-(h), page 32, as follows:

1. Add to Article 5, Section 1-(a), the following:

"The National Collegiate Trampoline Championships."

2. Amend Article 3, Section 2-(h), as follows:

"(h) The Gymnastics and Trampoline Rules and Meet Committee shall consist of seven members, one of whom shall be a director of athletics. One member of the Committee shall be elected chairman."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee.

Intent: To establish the National Collegiate Trampoline Championships as a separate event and provide for its administration; effective date: September 1, 1969.

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(a), page 40, and Article 3, Section 3, page 35, as follows:

1. Add to Article 5, Section 1-(a), the following:

"The National Collegiate Volleyball Championship."

2. Add to Article 3, Section 3, a new paragraph (i), as follows:

"(i) The Volleyball Tournament Committee shall consist of six members, one of whom shall be elected as chairman. The members shall be elected for terms of six years, one member to be elected each year. A member elected to the chairmanship may serve as chairman six years in addition to the years he may have served as a committee member.

The Volleyball Tournament Committee shall have charge and supervision of the National Collegiate Volleyball Tournament of the Association, subject to the provisions of Bylaw 5-2."

[NOTE: Upon adoption of these amendments, the appropriate insertions will be made in Bylaws 3-3-(a) and 5-2-(c).]

Source: NCAA Executive Committee and Council.

Intent: To establish the National Collegiate Volleyball Championship and provide for its administration; effective date: September 1, 1969.

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Sections 1-(a) and 2-(a), pages 40-41, as follows:

1. Add to Article 5, Section 1-(a), the following:

"The National Collegiate Water Polo Championship."

2. Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a), as follows:

"(a) Meets and tournaments of the Association shall be under the control, direction and supervision of the tournament committees of the particular sports, subject to the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by the Executive Regulations. If a tournament committee is not established for a given meet or tournament, the event shall be administered by the rules committee of that sport. In those instances of College Division competition on a regional basis, the College Committee shall have the responsibility for administering such events.

The Track and Field Rules and Meet Committee shall be responsible for the Association's Cross Country, Indoor Track and Field and Outdoor Track and Field Championships. The Swimming Rules and Meet Committee shall be responsible for the Association's Swimming and Water Polo Championships."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee and Council.

Intent: To establish the National Collegiate Water Polo Championship and provide for its administration; effective date: September 1, 1969.

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(b), page 40, as follows:

"(b) In addition, regional College Division competition may be conducted in the above sports and in the sport of football subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, provided any Such football contest also meets regional events shall satisfy the requirements established by the Executive Committee.

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require Executive Committee approval before inauguration of such events which would confirm existing practice.

E. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a), page 40, as follows:

"(a) Meets and tournaments of the Association shall be under the control, direction and supervision of the tournament committees of the particular sports, subject to the requirements, standards and conditions prescribed by the Executive Regulations. If a tournament committee is not established for a given meet or tournament, the event shall be administered by the rules committee of that sport. In those instances of College Division competition on a regional basis, the College Committee shall have the responsibility for administering such events unless a specific committee is established to administer a regional sports program.

The Track and Field Rules and Meet Committee shall be responsible for the Association's Cross Country, Indoor Track and Field and Outdoor Track and Field Championships."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm the College Football Committee's authority and to make possible similar authorizations in the future.

F. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(c), page 41, as follows:

"(c) The official playing rules of the Association shall govern the conduct of all such events. In sports in which the Association maintains rules committees, the rules adopted by said committees shall govern the conduct of all NCAA-sponsored events in those sports. In those sports in which the Association does not maintain rules committees, the NCAA event shall be conducted according to the following: Golf—U.S. Golf Association Rules; Tennis—U.S. Lawn Tennis Association Rules."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm the playing rules under which NCAA-sponsored events shall be conducted.

VI. EXTRA EVENTS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 7B, Section 1-(c), page 45, as follows:

"(c) The meet shall be conducted by competent track and field officials and proper medical supervision shall be provided as verified by the District member of the NCAA Track and Field Rules Committee from the District in which the event is located one of the NCAA representatives serving on the meet's administration committee."

Source: University of Michigan.

Intent: To transfer the stated responsibility from a member of the NCAA Track and Field Rules and Meet Committee to a local NCAA representative on the administration committee.

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 7C, Section 1-(c), page 46, as follows:

"(c) The meet shall be conducted by competent gymnastics officials and proper medical supervision shall be provided as verified by a member of the NCAA Gymnastics Rules Committee one of the NCAA representatives serving on the meet's administration committee."

Source: University of Michigan.

Intent: To transfer the stated responsibility from a member of the NCAA Gymnastics Rules and Meet Committee to a local NCAA representative on the administration committee.

VII. PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 1, page 47, as follows:

1. Amend Section 1-(a) by adding the following:

"(4) The 10th day in advance of the possible starting dates listed in above sub-paragraphs (1), (2) or (3) provided the member institution does not conduct spring football practice."

2. Amend Section 1-(a), last paragraph, as follows:

"The total playing schedule for any intercollegiate football team shall be limited in any one year to a maximum of ten contests (games or scrimmages) with outside competition to be played during the traditional fall season (exclusive of one scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of spring practice, provided that the game be with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students, or both, and exclusive of one postseason game approved by the Association's Extra Events Committee). A member institution which does not conduct spring football practice may play one additional game with another member institution on or between the last Saturday in August and the first Saturday in September."

Source: South Dakota State University.

Intent: To permit institutions which do not conduct spring football practice to commence fall practice 10 days earlier and to schedule an 11th football game during the period indicated.

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 8, Section 2-(b), page 48, as follows:

"(b) Postseason practice in basketball shall be prohibited; however, it shall be permissible to assemble the basketball squad for one day for purposes of taking squad pictures."

Source: NCAA Public Relations Committee; NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit assembling of an institution's basketball squad out of season for purposes of taking publicity pictures.

Appendix C

REVIEW OF INTERPRETATIONS

[The following interpretations were approved by the Council during 1968. Letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold face**. All page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1968 NCAA Manual.]

I. INSTITUTIONAL AID

(Article 3, Section 1 of the Constitution)

A. Revise O.I. 2-(c), page 15, as follows:

"(c) Gradation or cancellation of institutional aid during the period of its award for any other athletic reason, except that such aid may be graded or cancelled if the recipient (1) voluntarily renders himself ineligible for intercollegiate competition, or (2) fraudulently misrepresents any information on his application, letter-of-intent or tender, or (3) engages in serious misconduct warranting substantial disciplinary penalty. Any such gradation or cancellation of aid is permissible only if (1) such action is taken by the regular disciplinary and/or scholarship awards authorities of the institution, and (2) the student has had an opportunity for a hearing, and (3) the action is based on institutional policy applicable to the general student body.

"Example: A member institution may terminate the financial aid of a student-athlete if he is adjudged to have been guilty of manifest disobedience through violation of institutional regulations or established athletic department policies and rules applicable to all student-athletes. Construed to be manifest disobedience are disruptive actions which interfere with the normal and orderly conduct of an institution's athletic program, refusal to meet the normal good conduct obligations required of all team members and defiance of the normal and necessary directions of departmental staff members."

Source: NCAA Council.

B. Revise O.I. 2-(e), page 16, as follows:

"(e) Award of excessive complimentary tickets. Complimentary tickets may be awarded to team members in the sport involved, *and shall* but may not exceed four per student-athlete per contest and may not be sold or exchanged for value except the institution may purchase a student-athlete's complimentary tickets for a home contest at their face value. It is not permissible for an institution to purchase a student-athlete's complimentary tickets for an away contest; further, complimentary tickets for an away contest must be placed at a 'will call' station or similar location for receipt by the user and only in such numbers as are to be actually used."

Source: NCAA Council.

C. Revise O.I. 10, page 17, as follows:

"Special arrangements designed to provide a student-athlete with extra benefits which are not made available to the student body in general shall be considered to be violations of NCAA principles. Included in this category are special discounts on purchases, loans without interest, **guarantee of bond**, indefinite or special arrangements on installment payments, regular or periodic use of an automobile without charge or at a reduced charge and free transportation (or at reduced rates) to and from the site of a summer job; further, it shall not be permissible for an athletic staff member or other representative of the athletic interests of a member institution to sign or cosign a note with an outside agency to arrange a loan for a student-athlete or for the benefit of his family, relatives or friends. It is understood that this ruling is not intended to interfere with the regular administration of a member institution's loan fund for the student body in general.

Source: NCAA Council.

II. AWARDS

(Article 3, Section 1 of the Constitution)

A. Combine O.I. 19 and O.I. 20, pages 19-20, as follows:

"Individual intercollegiate athletic awards and similar mementoes to student athletes shall be limited to those approved and administered by the member institution, or its a member conference, in keeping with the traditional college following requirements: *as to what constitutes an acceptable award*.

"(a) Institutional awards for recognition of freshman or varsity intercollegiate athletic participation may include letter sweaters, letter jackets, sports blazers with appropriate institutional insignia or letter, watches or rings with institutional insignia or comparable identification, scrolls and plaques.

"(b) Awards for special events such as postseason football games, NCAA meets and tournaments and featured individual competition, may include medals, trophies, plaques, scrolls, watches, rings and jewelry of a similar nature. The cost of any such award may not exceed \$75.

"(c) Awards by a member institution or a member conference (or an organization approved by either) in recognition of conference or national championships, a special attainment or contribution to the institution's team or competitive season (e.g., scholar-athlete awards, most improved player, most minutes played) shall conform to paragraph (b).

"(d) 'Most valuable player' awards presented in established meets, tournaments and postseason football contests may be permitted if the selection of the recipient is by a recognized organization approved by a member institution or a member conference and the award conforms to paragraph (b).

"It is not permissible to provide awards or prizes of a tangible

nature to student-athletes Neither paragraph (b) nor (c) permits individual awards in recognition of specialized outstanding performances in particular contests or events."

Source: NCAA Council.

No. 2. Amend proposed revision II-A, paragraph (d), as follows:

"(d) 'Most valuable player' awards presented in established meets, tournaments and postseason football contests may be permitted if the selection of the recipient is by a recognized organization approved by a member institution or a member conference and the award conforms to paragraph (b).

"In each category, the awarding institution, conference or other organization may not provide more than one award in recognition of a student's athletic accomplishment.

"Neither paragraph (b) nor (c) permits individual awards in recognition of specialized outstanding performances in particular contests or events."

Source: NCAA Council.

III. PRINCIPLES GOVERNING FINANCIAL AID

(Article 3, Section 4 of the Constitution)

A. Add O.I. 46, page 22, as follows:

"The chairman of the regular committee or other agency for the awarding of scholarships and grants-in-aid to students generally, or his official designee, must sign the written statement required by Constitution 3-4-(c). The signature of the director of athletics, attesting to the committee's award, does not satisfy this requirement."

Source: NCAA Council.

B. Add O.I. 47, page 22, as follows:

"In the renewal of financial aid, a member institution must give the recipient a written statement which contains the information required by Constitution 3-4-(c) and the statement must be presented to the recipient within three weeks after the end of the spring term of the member institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

IV. ELIGIBILITY FOR NCAA EVENTS

(Article 4, Section 1 of the Bylaws)

A. Revise O.I. 101, page 50, as follows:

"A student shall be considered a transfer from a collegiate institution when its registrar or admissions office certifies that the student was officially registered and enrolled at said institution on the opening day of classes in any quarter or semester, or the student attended a class or classes in any quarter or se-

mester, or the athletic director certifies that the student reported on call for regular uniformed squad practice prior to the beginning of any quarter or semester. He shall not be considered a transfer (a) after enrollment or attendance only at classes in the summer school, night school, branch school (provided that the branch school does not conduct an intercollegiate athletic program), or extension course; (b) if he participates in a cooperative educational exchange program provided he is to receive his baccalaureate degree from the institution from which he transferred to participate in the exchange program; or (c) upon his return to his original institution after attendance of one semester or quarter at another collegiate institution for purposes of taking academic courses not available at his original institution or (d) upon return to his original institution after attendance of one academic year at another collegiate institution in accord with the program recommended by the appropriate academic officer at the original institution, provided he is in good academic standing at the time he leaves the original institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

B. Revise O.I. 104, page 51, as follows:

"The term 'junior college' refers to American junior colleges and is not descriptive of or applicable to the educational institutions of other nations. Students from foreign institutions, except those entering as bona fide exchange students, must comply with the full transfer rule of Bylaw 4-1-(d) to be eligible. A bona fide foreign exchange student is one who is sent by his government or is sponsored by the U. S. Department of State, Rotary International, the Ford Foundation, the Institute of International Education or similar organizations."

Source: NCAA Council.

No. 3. Amend proposed revision IV-B as follows:

"The term 'junior college' refers to American junior colleges and is not descriptive of or applicable to the educational institutions of other nations. Students from foreign institutions of college or university level except those entering as bona fide exchange students, must comply with the full transfer rule of Bylaw 4-1-(d) to be eligible. A bona fide foreign exchange student is one who is sent by his government or is sponsored by the U.S. department of State, Rotary International, the Ford Foundation, the Institute of International Education or similar organizations."

Source: NCAA Council

C. Revise O.I. 106, page 51, as follows:

"In the administration of Bylaw 4-1-(e), any participation during a season in an intercollegiate sport, regardless of time,

shall be counted as a season of competition in that sport. **Indoor and outdoor track and field shall be considered separate sports.**
Source: NCAA Council.

D. Add O.I. 110, page 51, as follows:

"A freshman who, in his second semester or third quarter of residence, begins competition in a freshman sport may continue to compete as a freshman until the end of the freshman season without affecting his varsity eligibility, provided he has not practiced or participated with the freshman or varsity squad in that sport during his preceding term or terms of residence."

Source: NCAA Council.

No. 4. Amend proposed revision IV-D by deleting the present paragraph and substituting the following:

"A freshman student who initially enters a college or university after the first term and who does not practice or participate with the freshman or varsity squad during the academic year in which he entered may begin competition in a freshman sport his second academic year and compete as a freshman until the end of that freshman season without affecting his varsity eligibility."

Source: NCAA Council.

V. INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY FOR NCAA EVENTS

(Article 4, Section 6-(b) of the Bylaws)

A. Revise O.I. 112, page 51, as follows:

"If a student who has attended at least one full academic year (two full semesters or three full quarters) at a collegiate institution transfers to an NCAA member institution, the second institution in determining his eligibility under this legislation shall count all academic courses and only academic courses taken at the previous institution, except that if a student, who did not predict 1.600 or better upon graduation from high school, transfers from a junior college, he must present a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 2.500 accumulative grade point average in order to be eligible for financial aid, participation in athletics or organized practice sessions at an NCAA member institution. The definition of academic courses is left to each institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

No. 5. Amend proposed revision V-A, as follows:

"If a student who has attended at least one full academic year (two full semesters or three full quarters) at a colle-

giate institution transfers to an NCAA member institution, the second institution in determining his eligibility under this legislation shall count all academic courses and only academic courses taken at the previous institution, except that if a student who did not predict 1.600 or better upon graduation from high school transfers from a junior college, he must be graduated from the junior college or present a minimum of twenty-four (24) semester hours or thirty-six (36) quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a 2.500 accumulative grade point average in order to be eligible for financial aid, participation in athletics or organized practice sessions at an NCAA member institution under this legislation. The definition of academic courses is left to each institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

B. Revise O.I. 113, page 51, as follows:

"The actual accumulative sixth, seventh or eighth semester high school ranking or grade point average shall be used. If the secondary school certifies in writing that class rank is unavailable, the student's grade point average may be used and prediction obtained through use of an Association-approved conversion table. If a high school graduate attends a college preparatory school, for a full academic year, he may must be judged by his predicted grade point average as a high school graduate or on the basis of his college preparatory record high school record. If a student transfers from a high school to a preparatory school prior to graduation from the high school, his high school rank must be used to establish predictability unless he has completed at least two full academic years at the preparatory school in which case either his high school or preparatory school rank may be used."

Source: NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements; NCAA Council.

No. 6. Amend proposed revision V-B by adding an effective date and amending the second sentence as follows:

"If the secondary school certifies states in writing that class rank is unavailable, the student's grade point average as certified by the high school may be used and prediction obtained through use of an Association-approved a conversion table developed by the Association."

"Effective Date: September 1, 1969, applicable to those student-athletes entering member institutions after the fall quarter or semester of that year."

Source: NCAA Council.

C. Revise O.I. 115, page 52, as follows:

"It is not permissible for a member institution to retest a student upon his enrollment at the institution and use that test

score in determining his prediction if prior to his enrollment the student had been tested and his prediction established. A student who has established a prediction may not achieve eligibility by means of a subsequent test after enrollment or reporting for uniformed squad practice, whichever is earlier."

Source: NCAA Council.

D. Revise O.I. 116, page 52, as follows:

"If a student's prediction has not been established and he reports for practice or competition, the student shall be required to take the ACT or SAT test on the first subsequent national test date and the institution shall be required to establish determine his prediction within four weeks from the time the student reports two weeks following the receipt of scores from such test. During the four-week period, until his prediction is determined, the student may engage in practice, but not participate in competition. At the end of the four-week period, if the student's prediction has not been determined, he must terminate his practice until the prediction is known and if he then eventually predicts 1.600 or better, he is eligible to continue practice and represent the institution in competition in accordance with other applicable institutional, conference and NCAA policies."

Source: NCAA Council.

E. Add O.I. 117, page 52, as follows:

"The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the American College Test (ACT) are the only tests which may be used to establish an acceptable table or a prospect's prediction. The scores submitted by a prospect must be those achieved at one sitting on a nationally administered test date."

Source: NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements; NCAA Council.

No. 7. Amend proposed revision V-E as follows:

"The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the American College Test (ACT) are the only tests which may be used to establish an acceptable table or a prospect's prediction. The scores submitted by a prospect must be those achieved at one sitting on a nationally administered test date. The qualifying test score submitted by a prospect must represent the total score achieved from a single attempt on any nationally administered test date."

Source: NCAA Committee on Academic Testing and Requirements; NCAA Council.

No. 8. Amend proposed revision V-E as follows:

"The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and the American College Test (ACT) are the only tests which may be used

to establish an acceptable table or a prospect's prediction. The scores submitted by a prospect must be those achieved at one sitting on a nationally administered test date, or on a test available to prospective students generally which is administered on a college or university campus under the authority of the SAT or ACT services."

Source: Big Ten Conference.

No. 9. Add a new O.I. 118, page 52, as follows:

"The Association's national experience tables shall be reviewed and brought up to date every five years; institutional and conference tables, every three years. All existing tables shall be reviewed for this purpose by September 1, 1969. The new tables will apply to those student-athletes entering member institutions after the fall quarter or semester of that year."

Source: NCAA Council.

VI. RECRUITING-USE OF FUNDS

(Article 6, Section 2 of the Bylaws)

A. Add a new O.I. 126, page 53, as follows, renumbering subsequent interpretations:

"The appearance of a prospective student-athlete on a television program conducted by the coach of an NCAA members institution or on a television program in which the coach is participating will place the member institution in violation of Bylaw 6-2."

Source: NCAA Council.

VII. RECRUITING-TRYOUTS

(Article 6, Section 3 of the Bylaws)

A. Revise O.I. 131, page 53, as follows:

"No member of an institution's coaching staff may conduct or participate in any coaching school, clinic or sports training camp involving prospective students. For the purpose of this interpretation, a prospect shall be one who is eligible for admission to college or who has enrolled for any academic study following completion of his junior sophomore year in high school."

Source: NCAA Council.

No. 10. Amend proposed revision VII-A as follows:

"No member of an institution's coaching staff may conduct or participate in any coaching school, clinic or sports training camp involving prospective students. For the purpose of this interpretation, a prospect shall be one who has enrolled for any academic study following completion of his sophomore completed his junior year in high school."

Source: NCAA Council.

No. 11. Amend proposed revision VII-A as follows:

"No member of an institution's coaching staff may conduct or participate in any coaching school, clinic or sports training camp involving prospective students. For the purpose of this interpretation, a prospect shall be one who enrolled for any academic study following completion of his sophomore year in high school. **This shall not apply to activities sponsored or approved by this Association.**"

Source: Big Ten Conference.

VIII. RECRUITING-VISITATIONS

(Article 6, Section 5 of the Bylaws)

A. Add O.I. 152, page 55, as follows:

"In general, the student's 'home,' as the term is used in Bylaw 6-5-(a), is the place of his legal residence. If, however, he is enrolled in a high school, a preparatory school or a junior college away from his legal residence, the place at which that educational institution is located shall be considered the student's 'home' while he is residing there."

Source: NCAA Council.

IX. RECRUITING-ENTERTAINMENT

(Article 6, Section 5 of the Bylaws)

A. Revise O.I. 154, page 55, as follows:

"There are two general locations in which it is permissible for a member institution or its alumni and other friends to provide reasonable entertainment to a prospective student-athlete, one being the institution's campus, and immediate environs home community and communities contiguous thereto, and the other being the prospect's hometown area home community and communities contiguous thereto. Transportation of a prospect to some other site for purposes of entertainment constitutes a violation of Bylaw 6-5-(d).

Source: NCAA Council.

X. LIMITATION ON PLAYING SEASONS

(Article 8, Section 1 of the Bylaws)

A. Add O.I. 178, page 57, as follows:

"If one of the first three days of an institution's practice schedule includes a Sunday used for 'non-contact conditioning drills,' that Sunday may not be counted toward fulfillment of the mandatory three-day conditioning practice requirement; further, in determining the number of preseason football 'practice opportunities,' Sunday is explicitly excluded from the counting."

Source: NCAA Council.

Appendix D

REVISIONS IN EXECUTIVE REGULATIONS

[The Association's Executive Committee is empowered by the Constitution to adopt Executive Regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution or Bylaws. Following are revisions in the Executive Regulations as adopted by the Executive Committee during 1968. Those letters and words which have been deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which have been added appear in **bold face**. Page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1968 NCAA Manual.]

I. FINANCIAL AND RELATED REPORTS

A. Revise Regulation 2, Section 6-(d), page 64, as follows:

"(d) A report covering the financial details of each championship event shall be submitted to the executive director of the Association not later than *ninety sixty* days following the conclusion of the competition and must bear the certification of both the games chairman in direct charge of the meet or tournament, and that of the rules, meet or tournament committee chairman concerned with that particular sport. The reports are to be submitted on an approved form supplied by the executive director, and shall be published in the Annual Reports of the Association."

II. DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS FOR INDIVIDUAL-TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

A. Revise Regulation 2, Section 8-(b), page 65, as follows:

"(b) An amount up to the traveling expenses of the competitors shall be prorated as follows: In cross country, the first 15 finishers; golf, the low 64 60 and ties after the qualifying rounds; tennis, the final 32 (16 singles players and eight doubles teams); and in fencing, gymnastics, skiing, swimming, track and field and wrestling, those who place and receive official awards. Such traveling expenses shall be based upon the actual cost of transportation up to first-class, round-trip railroad fare and standard Pullman, or commercial air fare, not to exceed jet coach, by direct route with no coverage for hotel bills, meals and other expenses."

III. DISTRIBUTION OF NET RECEIPTS FOR TEAM CHAMPIONSHIPS

A. Revise Regulation 2, Section 9, pages 66-67, by amending the first paragraph of Section 9 as indicated below and adding subsequent language:

"The net receipts from those *national* championship events

(baseball, basketball, football, ice hockey and soccer) in which only team championships are determined shall be distributed as follows."

College Division Football

"The Association's share of receipts from the College Division Regional Football Championships, which includes a percentage of gross ticket sales and radio rights and all television income, shall be forwarded to the NCAA executive office.

"Upon receipt of all financial reports the NCAA executive director shall deduct the expenses of the competing teams. Expense allowances shall be paid to a party of 45 persons on the basis of the actual cost of transportation up to first-class, round-trip railroad fare and standard Pullman, or commercial air fare, not to exceed jet coach, and a per diem approved by the Executive Committee.

"The executive director shall then deduct those expenses incurred by the College Football Committee and its representatives in matters of tournament administration.

"Any balance of net receipts remaining shall be divided with 75 per cent distributed evenly among the competing teams and 25 per cent to the College Football Reserve Fund."

- B. Revise Regulation 2, Section 9, page 66, by the addition of the following:

College Division Baseball

"Net receipts from regional tournament games and the championship finals shall be distributed according to the following formula:

"(a) An amount up to the actual traveling expenses not to exceed first-class, round-trip railroad fare and standard Pullman, nine sections, or commercial air fare, not to exceed jet coach, and a per diem allowance (for a party of 18) established by the NCAA College Division Baseball Tournament Committee and approved by the Executive Committee may be prorated among the competing institutions.

"(b) Any balance of net receipts remaining, after deducting the expenses specified in paragraph (a), shall be divided evenly between the NCAA and the competing institutions with the competing institutions' share being distributed evenly among them."

- C. Revise Regulation 2, Section 9, University Division Baseball, page 66, as follows:

"(b) Any balance of net receipts remaining, after deducting the items expenses specified in paragraph (a), shall be divided evenly between the NCAA and the competing institutions, with the competing institutions' share being distributed evenly among them."

- D. Revise Regulation 2, Section 9, University Division Basketball, page 67, as follows:

"The net receipts of University Division first-round, games and regional and finals tournaments, after deducting authorized games expenses, shall be forwarded to the NCAA executive office.

"Upon receipt of all financial reports, the NCAA executive director shall first deduct the expenses incurred by the Tournament Committee and its representatives in matters of tournament administration.

"He then shall divide the residue evenly between the Association and the competing institutions then shall deduct the expenses of the participating teams. Team expense allowances shall be paid to an official party of 18 persons on the basis of the actual cost of transportation up to first-class, round-trip railroad fare and standard Pullman, or commercial air fare, not to exceed jet coach, and a per diem allowance approved by the Executive Committee.

"The subsequent distribution to the competing teams shall be based on the number of tournament games played. The remaining receipts shall then be divided evenly between the Association and the competing teams, with the teams' share distributed according to the following formula:

"(a) Two units shall be awarded for all games; except

"(b) Three units shall be awarded for the first game played by a team which is awarded a first-round bye; and

"(c) Three units shall be awarded for the national semifinal and final games."

- E. Revise Regulation 2, Section 9, Ice Hockey, page 67, as follows:

"(a) Expense allowances shall be paid for an official party of 20 22 persons on the basis of the actual cost of transportation up to first-class, round-trip railroad fare and standard Pullman, or commercial air fare, not to exceed jet coach, and a per diem allowance approved by the Executive Committee.

"(b) Any balance of net receipts remaining, after deducting the items specified in paragraph (a), shall be divided evenly between the NCAA and the competing institutions, with the competing institutions' share to be distributed evenly among them."

- F. Revise Regulation 2, Section 9, Soccer, page 67, as follows:

"(b) Any balance of net receipts remaining, after deducting the items specified in paragraph (a), shall be divided evenly between the NCAA and the competing institutions, with the competing institutions' share to be distributed evenly among them."

IV. DESIGNATION OF DATES AND SITES

A. Revise Regulation 2, Section 12, third paragraph, page 68, as follows:

"NCAA championship competition shall not be scheduled or conducted on Sunday, except that if an emergency develops which causes postponement of an NCAA event *scheduled on Saturday, or if the competitive situation dictates a more expeditious completion of the meet or tournament*, Sunday competition may be permitted provided that **the competing institutions are agreeable and advance approval is obtained from the NCAA officers, and the administration of the participating institutions.** It is understood that institutional approval shall be sought after selection, but prior to participation in NCAA events."

Appendix E

REVISIONS IN RECOMMENDED POLICIES AND PRACTICES FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

[NOTE: The following revisions were approved by the Council during 1968. Letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold face**. Page numbers listed refer to corresponding pages in the 1968 NCAA Manual.]

I. PROFESSIONAL SPORTS

A. Revise Policy 5, page 74, as follows:

"In furtherance of the educational objective of intercollegiate athletics described in Constitution 3-9, member institutions should prohibit the *regular* use of their facilities by professional sports teams, it being understood that this does not apply to a professional team's **using isolated use of college facilities in isolated emergency cases, for purposes of practice.**"

II. STUDENT-ATHLETES' HOUSING

A. Add Policy 9, page 75, as follows:

"Member institutions should provide housing for student-athletes in the same manner as for non-athletes and should not provide 'athletic dormitories' or similar specialized housing arrangements for athletes."

Appendix F

REVISION IN ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURE

[The following revision was approved by the Council during 1968. Letters and words which are to be deleted appear in *italics* and those letters and words which are to be added appear in **bold face**. Page number listed refers to corresponding page in the 1968 NCAA Manual.]

A. Amend Section 5-(a)-(7), page 78, as follows:

"(7) A member institution which has been found in violation may be required to show cause why its membership in the Association should not be suspended or terminated if, in the opinion of the Council, it does not take appropriate disciplinary action against the head coach of the sport involved **and any other institutional employee if the circumstances warrant.** ('Appropriate disciplinary action' may include, for example, the prohibition of all recruiting in a specified sport for one year; the debarment of the head coach from any coaching, recruiting or speaking engagements for one year; termination of the coaching contract of the head coach and any assistant coaches involved; **suspension or termination of the employment status of any other institutional employee who may be involved.**")"

Source: American Football Coaches Association; NCAA Council.

Appendix G

1969 CONVENTION COMMITTEES

Nominating Committee

Chairman—Adolph W. Samborski

- District 1—Adolph W. Samborski, Harvard University
- District 2—Raymond J. Whispell, Muhlenberg College
- District 3—H. Boyd McWhorter, University of Georgia
- District 4—Walter L. Hass, University of Chicago
- District 5—David Swank, University of Oklahoma
- District 6—Kenneth W. Herrick, Texas Christian University
- District 7—Milton F. Hartvigsen, Brigham Young University
- District 8—Robley C. Williams, University of California, Berkeley
- At-large—James C. Loveless, DePauw University
- At-large—Earl C. Lory, University of Montana
- At-large—Dwight T. Reed, Lincoln University (Mo.)

Committee on Committees

Chairman—J. Neils Thompson

- District 1—DeLaney Kiphuth, Yale University
- District 2—David Busey, Lycoming College
- District 3—Herbert B. Thompson, Fisk University
- District 4—Robert C. James, Mid-American Conference
- District 5—Wade R. Stinson, University of Kansas
- District 6—Cliff Speegle, Southwest Conference
- District 7—Pete McDavid, University of New Mexico
- District 8—James G. Barratt, Oregon State University
- At-large—R. Jack Behringer, Grove City College
- At-large—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
- At-large—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin

Committee on Voting

Chairman—William Maybry

- District 1—Ross H. Smith, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- District 2—Albert Twitchell, Rutgers University
- District 3—Frank L. Forbes, Morehouse College
- District 4—Richard G. Shrider, Miami University (Ohio)
- District 5—Arthur W. Nebel, University of Missouri, Columbia
- District 6—James B. Higgins, Lamar State College of Technology
- District 7—Milton F. Hartvigsen, Brigham Young University
- District 8—Cameron S. Deeds, California State College, Los Angeles
- At-Large—William Maybry, Southwestern College (Tenn.)

Committee on Credentials

Chairman—Robert T. Bronzan

Robert T. Bronzan, San Jose State College

Ernest C. Casale, Temple University

Fred L. Miller, California State College, Long Beach

Committee on Memorial Resolutions

Chairman—Rev. Aloysius B. Begley

Rev. Aloysius B. Begley, Providence College

William Exum, Kentucky State College

John E. Faber, University of Maryland

Parliamentarian

Harry M. Cross, University of Washington

Chairman of Business Sessions

Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan

Chairman of Round Table

Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University

1970 Convention Site

Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 12-14

Appendix H

NCAA Convention Sites, 1944-1969

(Hotels in parentheses.)

*38th	1944	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (Saint Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)

*NOTE: Prior to 1944, the annual Convention was held in December. No meeting was held in 1943 and commencing with 1944 the Convention has been held in January.

Appendix I

Past and Present Officers of the NCAA

President

1906-1913	Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1914-1916	LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
1917-1929	Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U. S. Military Academy
1930-1932	Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
1933-1937	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1938-1940	William B. Owens, Stanford University
1941-1944	Philip O. Badger, New York University
1945-1946	Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
1947-1949	Karl E. Leib, University of Iowa
1950-1952	Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
1953-1954	Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama
1955-1956	Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
1957-1958	Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
1959-1960	Herbert J. Dorricott, Western Colorado State College
1961-1962	Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
1963-1964	Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
1965-1966	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1967-1968	Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
1969	Harry M. Cross, University of Washington

Secretary-Treasurer

*1906-1908	Louis A. Bevier, Jr., Rutgers University
*1908	William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia
1909-1939	Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
1940-1944	Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference
1945-1951	Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
1952-1954	Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska
1955-1956	Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958	Edwin D. Mouzon, Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960	Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962	Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964	Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966	Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968	Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969	William J. Flynn, Boston College

*Bevier served as secretary, Lambeth as treasurer, in 1908.